

THE

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

JULY, 1876.

ART. I.—*Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History.*—No. VI.

THE GREAT REVIVAL.

Anno Domini, 1800, Tennessee had a population, whites and blacks included, of one hundred and five thousand six hundred and two souls. Kentucky, of two hundred and twenty thousand, nine hundred and sixty. This third of a million occupied at that time a position of vastly more importance than any equal number of their Anglo-Saxon brethren. They were indeed a peculiar people on a marked theatre of action. The pioneers of American dominion and of Christian civilization; far, far in advance of all their compeers.

Consider for a moment their geographical position and surroundings, and the above statement will at once appear sober truth of history. They were indeed the advance guard, the outposts, the pickets and skirmish line of that mighty army of European migration, which was destined in two generations more to sweep over the entire Western Continent, halting only upon the shores of the great ocean; a movement of population, in the opinion of philosophers like DeTocqueville, unexampled for numbers and consequences since Northern Europe, nearly fifteen centuries ago, transferred her blood and dominion to all the regions of Southern and Western Europe.

So rapidly has this wonderful and favored republic developed since the days of our grand-parents, that even those whose studies lead them to analyze historic facts, have diffi-

culty in realizing the true course of events. The more this is done, the more vivid and important will appear the work accomplished by those who, three-quarters of a century since, occupied the two States above named.

A few facts out of many must answer our present purpose. With a map of the United States before us, these facts are doubly impressive. At the close of the last century, the great State of New York was served by one Attorney-General. In consequence of exposure in riding his circuit, he died at an early age, lamented as the pride and hope of an ancient and numerous kindred. Yet his remotest court was held at Utica, only ninety miles west of Albany. Western Pennsylvania, as well as western New York, was very sparsely peopled at this date. The vast region now forming the populous and powerful States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, then was the "North-western Territory," inhabited almost exclusively by Indians of the most warlike character, under the patronage and promptings of the British Government, which occupied then, as now, all the northern part of this continent by firm military possession, and whose rulers were preparing for future war with the young Republic. Ohio was not admitted as a State until 1803, and then with only the scant population of forty-five thousand souls, dwelling mainly in the angle between Virginia and Kentucky. Even as late as 1815, all the northern half of Ohio was a wilderness, under Indian control, with a few sparse settlements of whites.

To the south of Tennessee, the Cherokees held all northern Georgia, while the "Mississippi Territory," embracing very nearly all the present large States of Alabama and Mississippi, was in the quiet possession of Creeks, Choctaws, and Chickasaws. What was then called the Western District of West Tennessee, and is now known as West Tennessee, (the old West Tennessee having been sub-divided into Middle, and the present West, Tennessee,) was, as late as 1816, in the possession of the latter tribe of Indians.

Now, observe that Florida, on the south-east, and all the broad land west of the Mississippi river, which for so long a period was the pride and hope of the only real European ally

of the United States, and was called by that people Louisiana, or New France, at this date, 1800, was, and had been since 1762, in possession of Spain. As a rule, the administration of this government, then holding vast possessions on both American continents and in the West Indies, was not only unfriendly, but absolutely hostile to our own. Specially was this hostility made apparent and potent by intrigues with the very warlike Cherokees and Creeks, by which they were induced to oppose every obstacle to the progress of the emigrants from Virginia and North Carolina: for the Spanish Government by instinct, like the British, saw the handwriting upon the wall, and read in alarm the first syllables of those pages of history, which were to record the sweeping to the right and to the left, under Harrison and Jackson, by these very emigrants, of every vestige of opposition to American dominion between the Lakes and the Mexican gulf, and from the Father of Waters to the Rocky mountains on the west.

In the providence of God, the pioneers of Kentucky and Tennessee did a work second only to that accomplished by the founders of Massachusetts and Virginia. A work, too, without which the latter would have been inchoate and an abortion, instead of growing up into the most finely proportioned and magnificent edifice of dominion since the days of Roman power.

So much for the secular, now a glance at the spiritual. In 1800, amid this third of a million, we find perhaps two or three log colleges, in which masters, worthy indeed of the name, taught, and in which scholars destined to move senates and govern states, were instructed; schools comparatively many, considering the frontier character of the settlements, and with godly men in the teacher's seat; settled ministers maintained chiefly by teaching and farming; and itinerants, as yet not very numerous or efficacious. For this system, so well adapted to rapidly growing yet thinly peopled regions was in its infancy, the First Methodist General Conference having been held not sooner than 1788, if indeed before 1792.

On the other hand, Christianity was then far from walking

in golden slippers. Truly did wickedness dwell in high places. The long, persistent, Voltairean crusade against the religion of Christ, under the guise of historical science, was producing its ripest fruits. It was fashionable to avow skepticism, or else a vague deism. Republican France had literally turned the world upside down; and French doctrines were very popular on this side the water, particularly in the Democratic West. Hume and Gibbon were the classic historians everywhere conned by the cultivated; while Paine's *Age of Reason* was widely circulated among the ignorant and the young. The emigrants to these western wilds were composed of the boldest, hardest, most enterprising of the young and middle-aged of Virginia and North Carolina; and while the causes just mentioned brought about much infidelity throughout the Union, yet for reasons we have not time to assign now, they were peculiarly potent in the two States just named, and of course produced still more marked and pernicious results in their two children States, especially in Kentucky. Seventy-eight years ago, the Christian who would have prophesied that from these two first-born of the West a mighty Christian influence would proceed to every quarter of the land, East and West, North and South, would have been jeered and ridiculed as a wild enthusiast. Yet such was the fact then near at hand.

The Presbyterian Church, time out of mind, had the custom of holding its sacrament of the Lord's Supper not very often; and of making these sacraments occasions of three and four days meetings. Thus sprang up in 1797-8-9, in the congregations of James McGready, in Logan county, Kentucky, and in those of Wm. McGee, in Sumner and Robertson counties, Tennessee, the germs of that religious movement known as "the Great Western Revival." Very much has been written about this revival. It has given rise to much controversy; hence it has been much misrepresented. It certainly has been much underrated in the genuineness, depth, and permanence of its work, direct and indirect, near at hand and remote. It is safe to say that in the entire history of the evangelical Church, no religious movement known by this name "Revival," is to be found, which for

scripturalness of origin, wide-reaching and beneficent results, can be compared with that of 1800, in the Cumberland country, and which at once spread to the Blue Grass region of Kentucky.

This thesis I hope, when treating of James McGready, his life and work, fully to prove; now the attention is directed to an account given by an eye-witness, of what he saw in Kentucky in the summer and autumn of 1801, a most competent witness, George Addison Baxter, a young Presbyterian minister, who, it seems, took a long journey on horseback expressly to judge for himself of this strange work, of which he had heard many and conflicting reports. He afterwards became celebrated as President of Washington College, and Professor of Theology in Union Seminary, Virginia; and was all his life an active worker in revivals. It is addressed to another young Virginian, Archibald Alexander, a name to-day household, wherever Presbyterianism is known. It is written from what is now Washington Lee University.

I have copied from *The Revivalist*, January 9, 1833, in which it is credited to the New York *Evangelist*, where it occurs in a series of "Historical Sketches of Revivals," by a writer who credits the New York *Missionary Magazine*, Vol. III., for 1832.

WASHINGTON ACADEMY, VA., January 1, 1802.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR:—I now sit down, agreeably to promise, to give you some account of the revival of religion in the State of Kentucky. You have no doubt heard already of the Green river and Cumberland Revivals. I will just observe, that the last summer is the fourth since the revival commenced in those places; and that it has been more remarkable than any of the preceding, not only for lively and fervent devotions among Christians, but also for awakenings and conversions among the careless; and it is worthy of notice that very few instances of apostasy have hitherto appeared. As I was not myself in the Cumberland country, all that I can say about it is from the testimony of others; but I was uniformly told by those who had been there, that their religious assemblies were more solemn, and the appearance of the work much greater, than what had

been in Kentucky; any enthusiastic symptoms which might at first have attended the revival had greatly subsided, whilst the serious concern and engagedness of the people had visibly increased.

In the older settlements of Kentucky, the revival made its first appearance among the Presbyterians, last spring. The whole of that country, about a year before, was remarkable for vice and dissipation, and I have been credibly informed that a decided majority of the people were professed infidels. During the last winter appearances were favorable among the Baptists, and great numbers were added to their churches; early in the spring the ministrations of the Presbyterian clergy began to be better attended than they had been for many years since; their worshiping assemblies became more solemn, and the people, after they were dismissed, showed a strange reluctance at leaving the place; they generally continued some time in the meeting-houses, in singing or in religious conversation. Perhaps about the last of May, or the first of June, the awakenings became general in some congregations, and spread through the country in every direction with amazing rapidity. I left that country about the first of November, at which time this revival, in connection with the one in Cumberland, had covered the whole State, excepting a small settlement which borders on the waters of Green river, in which no Presbyterian ministers are settled, and I believe very few of any denomination. The power with which this revival has spread, and its influence in moralizing the people, are difficult for you to conceive, and more difficult for me to describe. I had heard many accounts, and seen many letters, respecting it, before I went to that country, but my expectations, though greatly raised, were much below the reality of the work.

The congregations, when engaged in worship, presented scenes of solemnity superior to what I had ever seen before; and in private houses it was no uncommon thing to hear parents relate to strangers the wonderful things which God had done in their neighborhoods, whilst a large circle of young people would be in tears.

On my way to Kentucky, I was told by settlers on the road,

that the character of Kentucky travelers was entirely changed, and that they were now as distinguished for sobriety, as they had formerly been for dissoluteness; and, indeed, I found Kentucky the most moral place I had ever been in; a profane expression was hardly heard, a religious awe seemed to pervade the country, and some deistical characters had confessed that, from whatever cause the revival might originate, it certainly made the people better. Its influence was not less visible in promoting a friendly temper; nothing could appear more amiable than that undissembled benevolence which governs the subjects of this work. I have often wished that the mere politician or deist could observe with impartiality their peaceful and amicable spirit. He would certainly see that nothing could equal the religion of Jesus for promoting even the temporal happiness of society. Some neighborhoods visited by the revival had been formerly notorious for private animosities, and many petty law-suits had commenced on that ground. When the parties to these quarrels were impressed with religion, the first thing was to send for their antagonists; and it was often very affecting to see their meeting; both had seen their faults, and both contended that they ought to make concessions, till at last they were obliged to request each other to forbear all mention of the past, and to act as friends and brothers for the future. Now, sir, let modern philosophists talk of reforming the world by banishing Christianity, and introducing their licentious systems. The blessed gospel of our God and Saviour is showing what it can do.

Some circumstances have occurred to distinguish the Kentucky revival from most others of which we have any account: I mean the largeness of the assemblies on sacramental occasions, the length of time they continued on the ground in devotional exercises, and the great numbers who have fallen down under religious impressions. On each of these particulars I shall make some remarks.

With respect to the largeness of the assemblies. It is generally supposed that at many places there were not fewer than eight, ten, or twelve thousand people. At a place called Cane Ridge meetinghouse, many are of opinion there

were at least twenty thousand; there were one hundred and forty wagons which came loaded with people, besides other wheel-carriages. Some persons had come two hundred miles. The largeness of these assemblies was an inconvenience; they were too numerous to be addressed by one speaker: it therefore became necessary for several ministers to officiate at the same time at different stands; this afforded an opportunity to those who were but slightly impressed with religion, to wander to and fro between the different places of worship, which created an appearance of confusion, and gave ground, to such as were unfriendly to the work, to charge it with disorder. Another cause, also, conduced to the same effect. About this time the people began to fall down in great numbers, under serious impressions. This was a new thing among Presbyterians; it excited universal astonishment, and created a curiosity which could not be restrained. When people fell, even during the most solemn parts of divine service, those who stood near were so extremely anxious to see how they were affected, that they often crowded about them so as to disturb the worship. But these causes of disorder were soon removed; different sacraments were appointed on the same Sabbath, which divided the people, and the falling down became so familiar as to excite no disturbance. In October I attended three sacraments. At each there were supposed to be four or five thousand people, and everything was conducted with strict propriety. When persons fell, those who were near took care of them, and everything continued quiet until the worship was concluded.

The length of time that people continued at the places of worship is another important circumstance of the Kentucky revivals. At Cane Ridge they met on Friday, and continued till Wednesday evening, night and day, without intermission, either in the public or private exercises of devotion; and with such earnestness that heavy showers of rain were not sufficient to disperse them. On other sacramental occasions they generally continued on the ground until Monday or Tuesday evening; and had not the preachers been exhausted and obliged to retire, or had they chosen to prolong the worship, they might have kept the people any length of time

they pleased, and all this was, or might have been, done in a country where, less than twelve months before, the clergy found it difficult to detain the people during the usual exercises of the Sabbath. The practice of encamping on the ground was introduced partly by necessity, and partly by inclination; the assemblies were generally too large to be received by any common neighborhood. Every thing, indeed, was done, which hospitality and brotherly kindness could do, to accommodate the people; public and private houses were opened, and free invitations given to all persons who wished to retire. Farmers gave up their meadows before they were mown, to supply the horses. Yet notwithstanding all this liberality, it would have been impossible, in many cases, to have accommodated the whole assemblies with private lodgings. But besides, the people were unwilling to suffer any interruption in their devotions; and they formed an attachment to the place where they were continually seeing so many careless sinners receiving their first impressions, and so many deists constrained to call on the formerly despised name of Jesus; they conceived a sentiment like what Jacob felt at Bethel—"surely the Lord is in this place. . . . This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven."

The number of persons who have fallen down under serious impressions in this revival, is another matter worthy of attention, and on this I shall be more particular, as it seems to be the principal cause why this work should be more suspected of enthusiasm than some other revivals.

At Cane Ridge Sacrament it is generally supposed that not less than one thousand persons fell prostrate to the ground, among whom were many infidels. At one sacrament which I attended, the number that fell was thought to be over three hundred. Persons who fall, are generally such as have manifested symptoms of the deepest impressions for some time previous to that event. It is common to see them shed tears plentifully for about an hour; immediately before they become totally powerless, they are seized with a general tremor, and sometimes though not often, they utter one or two piercing shrieks in the moment of falling. Persons in this situa-

tion are affected in degrees; sometimes when unable to stand or sit, they have the use of their hands, and can converse with perfect composure. In other cases they are unable to speak; the pulse becomes weak, and they draw a difficult breath about once in a minute; in some instances their extremities become cold, and pulsation, breathing, and all the signs of life forsake them for nearly an hour. Persons who have been in this situation, have uniformly avowed that they felt no bodily pain; that they had the entire use of their reason and reflection; and when recovered, they would relate everything that had been said or done near them, or which could possibly fall within their observation. From this it appears that their falling is neither common fainting, nor a nervous affection. Indeed, this strange phenomenon appears to have taken every possible turn, to baffle the conjectures of those who are not willing to consider it a supernatural work. Persons have sometimes fallen on their way to public worship; sometimes after they had arrived at home; and in some cases, when they were pursuing their common business on their farms, or when retired for secret devotion. It was above observed, that persons generally are seriously affected previous to their falling; in many cases, however, it is otherwise. Numbers of thoughtless sinners have fallen as suddenly as if struck with lightning; many professed infidels and other vicious characters have been arrested in this way, and sometimes at the very moment when they were uttering blasphemies against the work. At the beginning of the revival in Shelby county, the appearances, as related to me by eye-witnesses, were very surprising indeed. The revival had before this spread with irresistible power through the adjacent counties; and many of the pious had attended distant sacraments with great benefit; these were much engaged, and felt unusual freedom in their addresses to the throne of grace, for the outpouring of the divine Spirit, at the approaching sacrament in Shelby. The sacrament came on in September. The people as usual met on Friday, but all were languid, and the exercises went on heavily; on Saturday and Sunday morning it was no better; at the last, communion service commenced, every thing was still lifeless; whilst the minister

of the place was speaking at one of the tables without any unusual animation, suddenly there were several shrieks from different parts of the assembly; instantly persons in every direction fell, the feelings of the pious were suddenly revived, and the work progressed with extraordinary power till the conclusion of the solemnity. The phenomenon of falling is common to all ages, sexes and characters; and when they fall they are differently exercised; some pious people have fallen under a sense of ingratitude and hardness of heart; and others under affecting manifestations of the love and goodness of God; many thoughtless persons under legal convictions who have obtained comfort before they arose. But perhaps the most numerous class consists of those who fall under distressing views of their guilt, who arise with the same fearful apprehensions, and continue in that state for some days, perhaps weeks, before they receive comfort. I have conversed with many who fell under the influence of comfortable feelings, and the account they gave of their exercises while they lay entranced was very surprising. I know not how to give you a better idea of them than by saying that in many cases they appeared to surpass the dying exercises of Dr. Finley; their minds appeared wholly swallowed up in contemplating the perfections of deity, as illustrated in the plan of salvation; and whilst they lay apparently senseless and almost lifeless, their minds were more vigorous, and their memories more retentive and accurate than they had ever been before. I have heard men of respectability assert that their manifestations of gospel truth were so clear as to require some caution when they began to speak, lest they should use language which might induce their hearers to suppose that they had seen those things with their bodily eyes; but at the same time they had seen no image nor sensible representation, nor indeed any thing besides the old truths contained in the Bible. Among those whose minds were filled with the most delightful communications of divine love, I but seldom observed any thing exotic. Their expressions were just and rational, they conversed with calmness and composure, and on their recovering their use of speech, they appeared like persons recovering from a violent disease,

which had left them on the borders of the grave. I have sometimes been present when persons who fell under the influence of convictions obtained relief before they arose; in these cases it was impossible not to observe how strongly the change in their minds was depicted in their countenances; instead of a face of horror and despair, they assumed one open, luminous, and serene, and expressive of all the comfortable feelings of religion. As to those who fall down under legal convictions, and continue in that state, they are not different from those who receive convictions in other revivals, excepting that their distress is more severe. Indeed, extraordinary power is the leading characteristic of this revival, both saints and sinners have more striking discoveries of the realities of another world than I have ever known on any occasion.

I trust I have said enough on this subject to enable you to judge how far the charge of enthusiasm is applicable to it. Lord Littleton, in his letter on the conversion of St. Paul, observes (I think justly) that enthusiasm is a vain, self-righteous spirit, swelling with self-sufficiency, and disposed to glory in its religious attainments. If this be a good definition, there has been perhaps as little enthusiasm in Kentucky revivals as in any other. Never have I seen more genuine marks of that humility which disclaims the merit of its own duties, and looks to the Lord Jesus Christ as the only way of acceptance with God; I was, indeed, highly pleased to find that Christ was all in all in their religion as well as in the religion of the gospel; Christians in their highest attainments seemed most sensible of their entire dependence on divine grace, and it was truly affecting to hear with what agonizing anxiety awakened sinners inquired for Christ, as the only physician who could give them any help. Those who call these things enthusiasm ought to tell us what they understand by the spirit of Christianity. In fact, sir, this revival operates as our Saviour promised the Holy Spirit should, when sent into the world; it convinces of sin, of righteousness and of judgment, a strong confirmation to my mind both that the promise is divine, and that this is a remarkable fulfillment of it. It would be of little avail to ob-

ject to all this, that probably the professions of many were counterfeited; such an objection would rather establish what it meant to destroy; for, where there is no reality, there can be no counterfeit; and besides, where the general tenor of a work is such as to dispose the mere insincere professors to counterfeit what is right, the work itself must be genuine; but as an eye witness in the case, I may be permitted to declare, that the professions of those under religious convictions were generally marked with such a degree of engagedness and feeling as wilful hypocrisy could hardly assume; the language of the heart, when deeply impressed, is very distinguishable from the language of affectation. Upon the whole, sir, I think the revival in Kentucky among the most extraordinary that have ever visited the Church of Christ; and, all things considered, peculiarly adapted to the circumstances of that country. Infidelity was triumphant, and religion at the point of expiring; something of an extraordinary nature seemed necessary to arrest the attention of a giddy people, who were ready to conclude that Christianity was a fable, and futurity a dream. This revival has done it; it has confounded infidelity, awed vice into silence, and brought numbers, beyond calculation, under serious impressions. Whilst the blessed Saviour was calling home his people, and building up his church in this remarkable way, opposition could not be silent. At this I hinted above, but it is proper to observe that the clamorous opposition which assailed the work at its commencement, has been in a great measure borne down before it; a large proportion of those who have fallen were first opposers, and their example has taught others to be cautious, if it has not taught them to be wise.

I have written on this subject to a greater length than I at first intended; but if this account should give you any satisfaction, and be of any benefit to the common cause, I shall be fully gratified.

Yours with the highest esteem,

G. BAXTER.

To the Rev. A. Alexander.

In looking through the annals of the various Evangelical

Churches occupying to-day high places of honor and usefulness in the Valley of the Mississippi, constantly do we find the spiritual birth of distinguished ministers and eminent laymen and women carried back to this epoch the revival of 1800. Well may we include its central figure in the number of those whom divine providence has raised up to signally advance the interests of the Church of God. Wonderful are the adaptations of human instrumentalities in the upbuilding of that church. Saul is called from the crowd of Antichristian Rabbins, to become Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles. Jerome and Augustin, scholars, philosophers and saints, maintain Christian doctrine and piety upon the frontiers of a decaying empire; while the golden-mouthed (Chrysostom) orator boldly proclaims its truths at the licentious courts of despotic emperors. Boniface, the English Saxon, becomes the apostle of Teutonic nations, and prepares the way for Charlemagne to become the bulwark of western Christendom. Bernard maintains Christian zeal, and above all Christian charity and experimental piety, in the tumultuous days of the Crusaders. Luther, from the monks, revolutionizes all Northern Europe by setting free the Bible; while Calvin, from the lawyers of France, sows broad and deep the seeds of religious liberty, without which there can be no open Bible. Wesley, from the venerable cloisters of Oxford University, unbinds the gospel afresh, so that the poor again welcome its glad tidings. Edwards, pastor in the Connecticut Valley, missionary to evanescent Indians, revivalist and metaphysician, influences alike the lowliest and the loftiest. McGready, in the forest paradise of the central West, prays and is heard, and camp-meetings give an empire to Christianity more securely than ever did decree of potentate. Spurgeon opens his spacious auditorium in the mercantile center of the world's emporium, and millions take knowledge that he has been with Christ. From among the Sabbath-school workers of the great wheat market of America, goes forth an obscure but trained marksman, who, wielding the sling of David, overthrows the Goliath of this day—prayerless unbelief.

EXCESSES NOT PECULIAR TO THE GREAT WESTERN REVIVAL.

In pursuing the researches incidental to the work now in hand, my attention has been arrested by the manifest injustice done the actors in the revival of 1800, often unintentionally, by the habit some authorities have indulged in of characterising that wonderful work as being peculiarly marked by scenes of extravagant enthusiasm, strange bodily exercises, and all kinds of morbid excitement. This has been so persistently done that it has passed into general history, as multiplied quotations would prove did space allow.

The unreasonableness of this view will appear, when it is considered that the revival of 1800, extended over a vast region, amid a peculiar people, gathered from very distant and diverse sources, and entertaining widely different views on religion. And also that perhaps no similar display of divine grace ever took place alongside such bitter opposition, so ready and so capable of misconstruing and misrepresenting it in all its phases. Did space permit it could readily be shown, by detailed references to the history of revivals, that in all those points which have been referred to as spots and blemishes upon the great revival which ushered in the dawn of the nineteenth century in the Valley of the Mississippi, and left such ineffaceable traces for good throughout that imperial region, it is by no means singular or exceptional, although truly so in the extent, depth and magnitude of its consequences. A few citations from authorities readily at hand must suffice.

In 1739 and subsequent years, following the labors of the Tennents, Whitfield and others, a great revival took place in the Jerseys and contiguous colonies. Its history is at this day a household word with the Evangelical Christians of that region. It also gave occasion to much opposition and bitter controversy, resulting in the long continued schism of Old Side and New Side, of Synod of Philadelphia, and Synod of New York. In the midst of this agitation the Tennents did a great work for education in their famous Log College, out of which Princeton College and Theological Seminary grew. In Webster's "History of the Presbyterian Church in America," page 170, in a protest drawn up at the Synod,

which met May 27, 1841, among other points the Old Side ministers make the following against the revival party: "6. Their preaching the terrors of the law in such a manner and dialect as has no precedent in the word of God, but rather appears to be borrowed from a worse dialect; and so industriously working on the passions and affections of weak minds, as to cause them to cry out in a hideous manner, and fall down in convulsions, like fits, to the marring of the profiting both of themselves and others, who are so taken up in seeing and hearing these odd symptoms, that they cannot attend to or hear what the preacher says; and then, after all, boasting of these things as the work of God, which we are persuaded do proceed from an inferior or worse cause." Again on page 187, speaking of one of the most active and eminent of the revivalists: "In the very month (August, 1741,) of the rupture, Davenport went through his extraordinary career in Connecticut. He was no wild enthusiast, but a grave man, of great piety, of unblemished life; a powerful reasoner, no mean poet, and, what was of great importance in that colony, of one of its most ancient and honorable families. It is monstrous to pretend that he had a captivating eloquence, or could preach so as to depict as if before them hung and groaned the bleeding Saviour. His sermons were plain, not striking; his exhortations stirring and warm, but uttered in a strange singing tone that was intolerable to the careless, but which moved amazingly the feelings of the newly awakened, and of all who sympathized with him. Denouncing men as unconverted, walking with his hearers in procession through the streets, and from town to town, singing 'human composures,' or hymns of his own composing; burning pious books and gay apparel in one bon-fire, and setting up separate meetings; these, with the delusive notions of the witness of the Spirit, brought him into contempt, and caused his good to be evil spoken of. Friends and foes were thrown together in opposition to him, and good men, by their zeal against him, strengthened the hands of evil-doers, and led many to separate from the standing order, and forsake the ministrations of the faithful pastors." All Webster, from page 132 to page 294, is an inter-

esting comment upon the Western period we are reviewing. The great revival which he describes, however, took place amid comparatively large cities, in established and populous communities, adjacent to colleges, and with no dearth of gospel ministrations. In every respect the contrast is in favor of the West, as being far more regular and orderly.

I will now take an example from staid old England, as found in George Smith's "History of Wesleyan Methodism," Vol. I., pages 300-1-2-3-4: "In the spring of this year there was a great revival of religion at Everton and its neighborhood. Amongst the many clergymen to whom Wesley had been made, by the great Head of the Church, a minister of spiritual good, was Mr. Berridge, the clergyman of this parish. Toward the latter part of the preceding year, Wesley, being at Bedford, heard that Mr. Berridge desired to see him. He accordingly set out for Everton. 'I found,' says he, 'Mr. Berridge just taking horse, with whom I rode on, and in the evening preached at Wrestlingworth, in a large church well filled with serious hearers. . . . The next morning I preached in the church again. In the middle of the sermon a woman before me dropped down as dead, as one had done the night before. In a short time she came to herself, and remained deeply sensible of her want of Christ. We rode on to Mr. Berridge's, at Everton. For many years he was seeking to be justified by his works; but a few months ago he was thoroughly convinced 'that by grace' we 'are saved through faith.' Immediately he began to proclaim aloud the redemption that is in Jesus: and God confirmed his word exactly as he did at Bristol, in the beginning, by working repentance and faith in the hearers, and with the same violent outward symptoms. I preached at six in the evening and at five in the morning, and some were struck just as at Wrestlingworth. One of these was brought into the house, with whom we spent a considerable time in prayer.'

The following are extracts from the journal of an intelligent eye-witness of the effects produced by the ministry of Mr. Berridge and Mr. Hicks during the ensuing spring and summer: 'Sunday, May 20, 1759. Being with Mr. B——ll at Everton, I was much fatigued, and did not rise; but Mr.

B—— did, and observed several fainting and crying out while Mr. Berridge was preaching. Afterwards, at church, I heard many cry out, especially children, whose agonies were amazing: one of the eldest, a girl of ten or twelve years old, was full in view, in violent contortions of body, and weeping aloud. The church was equally crowded in the afternoon, the windows being filled within and without, and even the outside of the pulpit to the very top; so that Mr. Berridge seemed almost stifled with their breath; yet, feeble and sickly as he is, he was continually strengthened, and his voice, for the most part, distinguishable in the midst of all the outcries. I believe there were present three times more men than women, a great part of whom came from afar, thirty of them having set out at two in the morning, from a place thirteen miles off. The text was, "Having the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." When the power of religion began to be spoken of, the presence of God really filled the place; and while poor sinners felt the sentence of death in their souls, what sounds of distress did I hear! The greatest number of them who cried, or fell, were men; but some women and several children felt the power of the same Almighty Spirit, and seemed just sinking into hell. This occasioned a mixture of various sounds, some shrieking, some roaring aloud; the most general was a loud breathing, like that of people half strangled, and gasping for life; and, indeed, almost all the cries were like those of human creatures dying in bitter anguish. Great numbers wept without any noise; others fell down as dead; some sinking in silence; some with extreme noise and violent agitation. I stood on the pew-seat, as did a young man in the opposite pew, an able-bodied, fresh, healthy countryman; but, in a moment, while he seemed to think of nothing less, down he dropped with a violence inconceivable. The adjoining pew seemed to shake with his fall. I heard afterwards the stamping of his feet, ready to break the boards, as he lay in strong convulsions at the bottom of the pew. Among several that were struck down in the next pew, was a girl, who was as violently seized as he. When he fell, Mr. B——ll and I felt our souls thrilled with a momentary dread; as

when one man is killed by a canon-ball, another often feels the wind of it.

Among the children who felt the arrows of the Almighty, I saw a sturdy boy, about eight years old, who roared above his fellows, and seemed in his agony to struggle with the strength of a grown man. His face was red as scarlet; and almost all on whom God laid his hand, turned either very red, or almost black. When I returned, after a little walk, to Mr. Berridge's house, I found it full of people. He was fatigued, but said he would, nevertheless, give them a word of exhortation. I stayed in the next room, and saw the girl whom I had observed so peculiarly distressed in the church, lying on the floor as one dead, but without any ghastliness in her face. In a few minutes we were informed of a woman filled with peace and joy, who was crying out just before. She had come thirteen miles, and is the same person who dreamed Mr. Berridge would come to her village on that very day wherein he did come, though without either knowing the place or the way to it. She was convinced at that time. Just as we heard of her deliverance, the girl on the floor began to stir. She was then set in a chair, and, after sighing awhile, suddenly rose up rejoicing in God; her face was covered with the most beautiful smile I ever saw. She frequently fell on her knees, but was generally running to and fro, speaking these and the like words: "O what can Jesus do for lost sinners! He has forgiven all my sins! I am in heaven! O how he loves me! and how I love him!" Meantime, I saw a thin, pale girl, weeping with sorrow for herself and joy for her companions. Quickly the smiles of heaven came likewise on her, and her praises joined with those of the other."

THE GREAT WESTERN REVIVAL OF TRUE PRESBYTERIAN LINEAGE.

In this connection it should be remembered that the Presbyterian has always been a revival Church. The Cumberland Presbyterians, in favoring revivals, have not, as too often hinted or stated by persons writing from different stand-points, introduced a Methodistic element. They have merely followed, and perhaps expanded, ideas, feelings, and customs, which from the beginning prevailed among their

fathers in Scotland. The following extracts from Hetherington are conclusive. If there has been any *following*, Wesley and his associates copied from the Scotch Presbyterians, when they brought prominently forward the emotional element in the Established Church of England.

In the Assembly of 1596, the first thing which occupied attention "was an overture from John Davidson, minister of Prestonpans, concerning the necessity of reforming the many prevalent corruptions of the Church and the country. The overture met with unanimous approbation; the conscience of every man present convincing him of his own need of humiliation and repentance. Order was given that a written form of confession should be drawn up, containing an enumeration of the evils to be reformed, under the four following heads: corruptions in the persons and lives of the ministers of the gospel; offenses in his majesty's house; the common corruptions of all estates, and offenses in the courts of justice. On the motion of Melville, the means to be employed for reforming ministers, and the censures to be inflicted on them for particular acts of delinquency, were specified. As confession is the primary step of reformation, the members of Assembly agreed to meet by themselves, for the purpose of jointly confessing their sins, and 'making promise before the majesty of God' to amend their conduct. They met accordingly in the Little Church, on Tuesday, the 30th of March. John Davidson, the author of the overture, was chosen to preside and lead their devotional exercises. So deeply searching were his words, that they wrought conviction in every heart; and his earnest and humble confession of sin drew tears of sincere penitence from every eye. While they were in this frame of mind, he called upon them to pause, and in the privacy of their own souls to acknowledge, each man for himself, his personal guilt before God. For a quarter of an hour a solemn stillness reigned, broken only by deep-drawn sighs, and heavy, half-stifled sobs, as each man searched apart the dark chambers of his own bosom. After another fervent prayer and impressive address, they rose from their seats at his desire, and lifting up their right hands, they renewed their covenant with God, 'protesting to walk

more warily in their ways, and to be more diligent in their charges.”

This solemn confession of sin, by order of the Assembly, was repeated in each Synod, Presbytery, and congregation; and with such manifestations of sincere contrition as proved that it both sprang from, and was accompanied by, the all-pervading power of the Spirit of God. It was indeed a great revival, and communicated to the Church of Scotland a spiritual strength enabling her to live through a period of dreary oppression and prostrate suffering.

And a generation later: “In no individual instance, probably, was the converting power of the Spirit more signally displayed than at the kirk of Shotts, on Monday, the 21st of June, 1630. It appears that John Livingstone, a young man of about twenty-seven years of age, who was at that time domestic chaplain to the Countess of Wigton, had gone to attend the dispensation of the Lord’s Supper at the kirk of Shotts. There had been a great confluence of both ministers and people from all the adjoining country; and the sacred services of the communion Sabbath had been marked with much solemnity of manner, and great apparent depth and sincerity of devotional feeling. When the Monday came, the large assembly of pious Christians felt reluctant to part, without another day of thanksgiving to that God whose redeeming love they had been commemorating. Livingstone was prevailed upon to preach, though reluctantly, and with heavy misgivings of mind, at the thought of his own unworthiness to address so many experienced Christians. He even endeavored to withdraw himself secretly from the multitude; but a strong constraining impulse within his mind caused him to return, and proceed with the duty to which he had been appointed. Towards the close of the sermon, the audience, and even the preacher himself, were affected with a deep, unusual awe, melting their hearts and subduing their minds, stripping off inveterate prejudices, awaking the indifferent, producing conviction in the hardened, bowing down the stubborn, and imparting to many an enlightened Christian a large increase of grace and spirituality.”

And now a century later: “The year 1742 will be forever

memorable, not only in the annals of the Church of Scotland, but in the history of Christianity, on account of the remarkable revivals of genuine religion which took place at that time in various parts of the country, particularly at Cambuslang and Kilsyth. It was at Cambuslang that this remarkable manifestation of spiritual power first appeared. The minister of the parish, the Rev. Mr. Macculloch, had been peculiarly earnest in preaching the characteristic doctrines of the gospel, regeneration and justification by faith, during the greater part of the year 1741; and a greater degree of quickened attention than usual began to appear in the congregation in the course of that winter, and early in the year 1742. At length, on the 18th of February, the people who attended meetings for prayer, which had been previously established, manifested such a degree of intense anxiety for their spiritual interests, and such deep convictions and supplicating earnestness to hear of the Saviour, that Mr. Macculloch was constrained to preach to them almost daily, and to request the assistance of his friends in the ministry from other quarters. This naturally excited the attention of the kingdom; and ministers of the most undoubted piety, and the highest character for theological attainments and soundness of judgment, hastened to the spot, to satisfy their minds by personal investigation, and returned not only convinced of the reality of what they had seen, but filled with gratitude to God that they had enjoyed the privilege of beholding so glorious a proof of the convincing and converting power of the Holy Spirit. Among these may be mentioned Dr. Webster, of Edinburgh, Dr. Hamilton, and Messrs. McLaurin and Gillies, of Glasgow, Willison of Dundee, Bonar, of Torpichen, and Dr. Erskine, of Edinburgh, at that time a young man pursuing his theological studies. The celebrated Whitefield, hearing of this remarkable event, hastened to Cambuslang, and preached repeatedly with his usual eloquence, and more than usual impressiveness."

Did space allow I could furnish much more reading like this. Cumberland Presbyterians feel very much at home in perusing such narratives. And, as in the days of their fathers, are not surprised that Hetherington dwells upon the opposi-

tion exhibited not only by the irreligious and the formalist, who looked upon the whole movement as the delusion of heated enthusiasts and fanatics, but also by some truly pious men and experienced ministers, who viewed the advocates of these religious revivals with distrust, and assailed them with bitterness.

ART. II.—*The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament.*

THE prophet Joel, speaking for the Lord, said: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions; and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit." Joel ii. 28, 29. Peter, in his powerful sermon on the day of Pentecost, denied the mild charge of the mockers and said, "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel;" evidently meaning that the outpouring of the Spirit on that day was the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy.

According to St. John, xiv. 15, 16, 17, the Saviour said to his disciples: "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Again, xv. 26: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." Also, xvi. 7: "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." In St. John, vii. 39, is the following: "But this spake he of the Spirit, which

they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." In Acts xix. 2, it is taught that some who were recognized as disciples had "not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."

What do these scriptures teach? Are they to be interpreted so as to teach that no Holy Spirit was known on the earth, or in connection with the affairs of men, previously to the glorification of the Son? Was there no *spirit* in the religion of God's people, no life in the body of the church, no fire in the souls of good men, until the wonderful outpouring after our Lord's ascension? Such an interpretation cannot be admitted. The evidence is abundant that the Spirit has had some connection with earthly affairs from "the beginning." Something analogous can be seen in the facts of record concerning our Saviour. He appeared in the fullness of time. His birth and life occurred, his offering was made, his atonement was "finished," thousands of years after men were multiplied on the earth. But it must not, therefore, be inferred that there was no Saviour, consequently no salvation, previous to the death of Christ on the cross. The efficacy of the propitiatory offering completed by the Lord on Calvary took effect immediately in the day when man sinned, and it has been efficacious ever since. The work of the Spirit is intimately connected with the sacrifice of the Son. The efficacy of that sacrifice is made available to man by the agency of the Spirit. Whenever, therefore, a soul is saved, there is the evidence of the presence and the power of the Spirit. It is freely, gladly admitted that the Christian dispensation, when compared with times and things embraced in the Old Testament history, is pre-eminently the dispensation of the Spirit. Under the Old Testament, types and shadows prevailed; under the New, the thing typified answers to the type, the substance responds to the shadow. The beginning of time is in the Old; the fullness of time is in the New. Sacrificial offering was begun under the Old; it is perfected under the New. Under the Old, the way of life was dimly seen; the Sun of Righteousness shines full upon it under the New. God's word, and his church, and his worship, were limited to *one*

people under the Old; under the New, the Master says, "Go ye, therefore, and teach *all* nations." Under the Old, the Spirit was somewhat restricted in its work; under the New, it is *poured out*. A drop was found in the bucket then; now we have the bucket full. Ages were consumed in the development of the plan of salvation, but the essential agencies of that plan must have been with it from the beginning.

The work of the Holy Spirit in times previous to the coming of Christ, was the same as it is in times subsequent.

Several reasons may be given in support of this proposition.

1. Mankind is a unit. Human nature is the same in all ages. Depravity belongs to the race. Moral degradation characterizes the whole family. The necessities of man in spiritual matters are as great in one age as in another.

2. There is but one way of life. Whosoever would attain to salvation must walk in that way. Christ is the way. Good men in the former times looked by faith to the coming Messiah, and were saved.

3. The Holy Spirit is the only agency known in the plan of redemption that is able to quicken into life that which is dead in trespasses and in sins, to rectify the moral derangement of man, to purify the heart, and to prepare him for admission into that place where nothing shall enter that "worketh abomination or maketh a lie." Had there been no Spirit in the former times, then there would have been no regeneration, no being born of the Spirit, no newness of life, nor salvation.

4. Justification is by faith. The Old Testament abounds in practical illustrations of faith. St. Paul has enumerated a long list of worthies noted for their unyielding confidence in the living God. A strong faith, such as was imputed for righteousness, is always attended by the life-giving Spirit.

5. The work of Christ is a unity, underlying and supporting, as a foundation, the whole plan of redemption. The Holy Spirit is divine, and possessed of the attributes of deity like the Son. He is equally a person of the Godhead, and like the Son, is interested in the great work of salvation. Most reasonably, therefore, may it be said that the work of the Spirit from the beginning unto the end is a consistent whole.

But in order to put this question in a strong light, it will

be better to appeal to the Old Testament scriptures and learn what they teach about the work of the Spirit. In these scriptures, however, it may be seen that the Spirit of God was interested in the affairs of this world before man was created. It is worthy of note that the first sentence in the Bible teaches the plurality of the Godhead, and the third sentence teaches the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. "The earth was without form and void." There was a wide waste of waters. "And darkness"—not only darkness but deadness—"was upon the face of the deep." No life was seen in the earth, or air, or sea. A profound silence, a fearful stillness, with the darkness, reigned supreme. In that condition of the earth, "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Nothing is taught of the manner of its moving. No intimation is given of whence it came or whither it went. Nor does the sacred historian stop to tell us for what purpose, or how long, the Spirit "moved upon the face of the waters." Evidently it was for some purpose. It was not an act of creation, for the "heaven and the earth" were already created. What, then, was the object of this moving? In the sentence immediately preceding, it is said, "darkness was upon the face of the deep." In the sentence immediately following is recorded the first appearance of *light*. From this relation of the facts in the history, is it not reasonable to infer that the moving of the Spirit upon the face of the waters had something to do with the removal of the darkness and the coming of the light? And does not this illustrate to some extent the work of the Spirit upon the cold, dull heart of man? The heart is spiritually dead; moral darkness enshrouds it; the Spirit of God moves upon it, touches it, quickens it, arouses it, helps it, until, under the proper conditions, God says, "Let there be light," and lo! darkness flees, and light reigns! The Spirit, therefore, may be called the life-giving power of the Godhead.

In the Old Testament many passages occur which teach directly of the dealings of the Spirit with men, and many others which cannot be fairly interpreted without including the work of the Spirit. Some of these are presented.

1. The case of Samson. Judges xiii. 25: "And the Spirit of

the Lord began to move him at times in the camp of Dan between Zorah and Eshtaol;" xiv. 6: "And the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and he rent him as he would have rent a kid;" 19, "And the Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he went down to Ashkelon, and slew thirty men of them, and took their spoil, and gave change of garments unto them which expounded the riddle." Here is an account of a man remarkable for strength and courage. But it is worthy of note that the exhibitions of his strength and courage were made after the Spirit of the Lord had come upon him.

2. The case of Saul. 1 Samuel x. 6: "And the Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man;" 10: "And when they came thither to the hill, behold a company of prophets met him, and the Spirit of God came upon him, and he prophesied among them;" xi. 6: "And the Spirit of God came upon Saul and he heard those tidings, and his anger was kindled greatly;" xvi. 14: "But the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him." In these passages we have some account of the dealings of the Spirit of God with the impulsive, headstrong King of Israel. And while they teach that the Holy Spirit operates upon the mind of man, they also teach distinctly the separate agency of man even under such an influence. It does not at all pertain to the purpose of this article to discuss the character of either Saul or Samson. Both were men of various experience, and the history of such experience can be made instructive.

3. The case of David, particularly his experience as brought to view in his prayer recorded in the fifty-first Psalm: "Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me." The Holy Spirit was, therefore, with him. It was not at that time a comforter unto him, but a convicting Spirit. David was fearfully sensible of his sin against God. He made confession, and prayed to be cleansed from his sin. Evidently it was the Holy Spirit that was arousing him to such a consciousness of crime. He desired to be delivered from blood-guiltiness, but he was unwilling for the Holy Spirit to leave him. And why? Was it not because he believed that after he should be forgiven, the Holy Spirit would become his

comforter? Yea, rather, did he not believe that the Spirit itself was to be the agent that would wash him from his iniquity and cleanse him from his sin?

4. The inspiration of the prophets. On this we have the testimony of an Apostle. St. Peter, in his second epistle, i. 21, says: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The natural man knows not what the morrow may bring forth. In the wisdom of God the future is darkly veiled. The human mind in its highest state of cultivation is limited in knowledge. The past and the present are but little known. The discovery of some important fact or principle in nature before unknown, is heralded with delight over the civilized world, and its discoverer gains lasting renown. How wonderful the case of the prophet! The Holy Spirit came upon him, moved upon his mind and breathed into it a supernatural efficiency. It was raised above the ordinary level, extended beyond the ordinary limit, and fully prepared for its responsible work. The veil of the future was lifted, and coming events of hundreds and thousands of years were made visible to the prophet's eye. Matters civil, political, and religious were revealed. Wars, famines, pestilences; the rise and fall of empires, the passing away of old customs and the establishing of new, were some of the things made known to the prophets. Who, except the omniscient God, could, of his own ability, know these things? Yet, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, the time and circumstances of their coming are put on record for the instruction of men.

5. The Psalmist, cxix. 18, says: "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." Surely he did not mean a literal opening of the natural eye. This was within his own power. What then did he mean? Evidently he desired the Lord to assist him intellectually, to shed light on the "eye of the mind" and enable it to see—enable the mind to comprehend—the wondrous things contained in the law. The Psalmist did not ask that the things of the law should be made plainer, nor that the knowledge of them should be thrust into his mind. He simply wanted the eye

opened, and then he could see. This opening of the mental eye can be accomplished only by the Spirit of God moving upon the mind. The work of the Spirit, in this case, the Psalmist desired should be an assistance in the increase of knowledge.

The interpretation of certain dreams by Joseph and Daniel, furnishes other exemplifications of the truth that the Spirit can *open* the mental eye. They both were peculiarly situated, and both were under hard masters. Dreams occurred, and each was enabled to interpret that of his master. But how is it possible for one man to know what "in the visions of the night" passes through another man's mind? And how could the meaning of the vision be known? Surely such things lie beyond the mind's natural ken. But if some friendly aid is given and the eye of the mind is opened more, there will be a wider range of intellectual vision, and a consequent increase of knowledge. Such was the Spirit's work.

In the examples presented it will be seen that the mode of the Spirit's operation was direct. There was no intermediate agency or instrument used as a means of reaching the mind. The Spirit in the exercise of its own sovereignty, moved upon the minds of those to be influenced, and by this taught the important truth in theology that the Spirit of the Lord can and does come into contact with the spirit of man. Mark the language used in reference to Samson: "the Spirit of the Lord began to move him." How could it move him without working upon his mind? Concerning Saul, it is said that "the Spirit of the Lord came upon him." The mind of Saul was so aroused that he prophesied. Did not the Spirit, then, do its work on the mind? The Spirit was not slow in reaching the heart in David's case. It came directly upon him, aroused his conscience, and made him feel most keenly a sense of guilt. As to the prophets, there can be no reasonable doubt but that the Spirit's work was immediate. A belief in their inspiration requires the further belief that the inspiring agent came upon, or into, the mind. This seems to have been the usual mode of operating in those times, and certainly it has not been abandoned in modern times. This view of the sameness of the Spirit's work is a pleasant doc-

trine. It, with others, teaches that the Christian religion is no patch-work. All the essential conditions and agencies have been the same from the beginning. There is one foundation, one faith, one baptism by the Holy Ghost, one way of life, one eternal home.

Doctor Beard, in Lecture xxiv. on Faith, says: "Religion, whatever it may be, is the same spiritual experience under both dispensations, the old and the new, everywhere. In every individual subject it consists of affections, exercises, and actions. These affections, exercises, and actions, are intrinsically the same in every case. They may be prompted and developed by different views, by different influences, motives, and agencies; but still, I say they are the same in every case. This seems to me self-evident. If, therefore, trust in God, as it is developed in the Old Testament, was formerly the great means of salvation, and faith in God, or faith in Christ, as it is developed in the New Testament, is now the great means of salvation, we infer that the exercises are the same."

If under both dispensations faith is the same, and religion is the same, surely the work of the Holy Spirit, which assists in our faith and is the life of our religion, is the same. "The Lord our God is one Lord," whether he is regarded in the person of the Father, the Son, or the Holy Ghost.

ART. III.—*Modern History of Sunday-Schools.**

IN presenting this sketch, it is not expected that any thing more than an outline should be given. The Sunday-school was not the product of an hour; neither are its progress and developments, for nearly a century, to be embodied in a short

*This sketch was prepared by order of Marshall Presbytery, and delivered before that body in its Sunday-school Institute, April 21, 1876. The Presbytery requested the author to send a copy of it to the THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM for publication. In compliance with that request it appears here.

sketch. The fully panoplied system of to-day is the monument in testimony of the lives and labors of many who have sacrificed upon her altars. The names of many good and philanthropic men and women, have risen above the horizon of the historic page, and are now with the swiftness of time approaching the zenith of modern fame. The nineteenth century, if it leaves no other remembrancer, will in this have erected a monument that will rise to an Alpine height, and offer an inviting example to succeeding ages.

The same law of progress that has characterized the Church in modern times, has bestowed its bounties upon the Sunday-school system. See it in infancy.

The object had in view by Mr. Raikes (who is unjustly called the prime originator) was scarcely more than to protect the Sabbath, a thing that all good citizens would love to do. Mr. Raikes was not a Christian when he made his first effort to civilize the neglected youths of Gloucester. Hence, he did not have a true Christian object in view. Six years of his philanthropic labors had gone to record before he knew Christ in his own heart. The first effort was to teach the children to read and write. These children were the inmates of a pin-factory. They had not the literary advantages of other classes of society, and hence Sunday was appropriated as their seed-time in literary pursuits. After this an improvement was made by the introduction of the Bible as the reading book. The next step was to induce the children to commit the Bible to memory. This idea of mere memorizing became the hobby of all the schools, until the physicians advised its delay because of the appearance of a then new disease called *Hydrocephalus*—or water on the brain—which is said to be the result of an overtaxed memory. Question-cards were then substituted, and soon question-books became the hobby. In a short time this became monotonous. Then they appealed to the imagination, and resorted to stories and anecdotes until they became stale. Next theology was administered in heroic doses, after which a style was inaugurated that they denominated *spiritual teaching*, which was merely exhortation.

Thus a long series of experiments was tried, touching the

different faculties of the child, trying to find through which he could best be instructed, until the key-note was sounded, and it was found that the best plan was to comprehensively grasp and rightly use them all, and not make a hobby of any. Variety is much more necessary for the child than for the adult.

The extension of education amongst the people thus commenced by the establishment of Sunday-schools, created a demand for a cheap and pure literature, which was not being met by the general publishers. Therefore, to meet that demand THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY was established in May, 1799. It has been a useful institution, and a great blessing to the world.

The Bible being introduced into those schools, created a similar demand for the Scriptures, which led to the establishment of THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY, in the year 1804.

What a great work has these societies accomplished in their own name! Yet, the Sunday-school appears in their background.

The first Sunday-schools seem to have been designed only for the poor and lower classes. For a long time the wealthy and higher classes of society thought it too great a compromise of dignity for their children to be found in a Sunday-school. In Great Britain, the work is still embarrassed, to some extent, by such an idea. Rev. Lyman Beecher, D. D., was the active agent in correcting such an improper estimation of the cause in the United States. He did it, not by precept, but by example. He first determined to take his own children to the Sunday-school, and then induced two of the most aristocratic families of his church to join him in the undertaking to popularize the cause. This created no little excitement. However, it soon met with almost universal approval and adoption; and in a short time the reform became complete throughout our country.

It would be well to speak here of the improvements made in Sunday-school music. A number of years had elapsed before a general attempt was made to adapt music to children. There was at first a great passion for hymn-learning, but it

consisted in committing the verse to memory; and even when it was sung, it was in a style distasteful to the children. But now, a perfect harmony is sought between the child's nature, the matter of the hymn, and the character of the music employed. It is now designed that the hymn contain a pure gospel sentiment, while the accordant variations of the tones employed, are so modulated as to greatly impress such truths upon the heart. Music has become one of the most important exercises of the Sunday-school. It would fail without it. It was the remark of a wise man: "Let me make the ballads for a nation and I care not who makes its laws."

The year 1816 was characterized by another profitable improvement—the establishment of the *Infant Class* by Robert Owen, of New Lanark, in Scotland. Previously to this, those who attended the Sunday-school were generally between six and fourteen years of age. It was not thought that children from two to five years old could be taught gospel truth. But Mr. Owen determined to make the experiment; and here, in that experiment, originated the plan of object-teaching, so popular at the present day. The method of instruction was a happy combination of exercise, relaxation, and learning. Nothing was made toilsome. The cultivation of kind and benevolent dispositions, and the inculcation of moral and religious feelings, were prominent parts of the plan. This plan grew in interest until the year 1823, when the committee of the *London Sunday-school Union* devoted one of their quarterly conferences to the consideration of the question, "Are infant schools beneficial? and how far are they adapted to promote the objects of Sunday-schools?" There was little, if any, hesitation in answering the first part of this question in the affirmative; but there was some difference of opinion as to the latter part of it. The conclusion, however, was that if infant classes became general, teachers would no longer have to be chiefly employed in rooting up the weeds and briars, but only in continuing an excellent system of moral and religious cultivation; it would, therefore, be a profitable part of the Sunday-school.

A few years later gave origin to the *Senior Class*, now so popularly known as the *Bible Class*. It had been the custom

to dismiss pupils at the age of fourteen years, but about the year 1830, it was determined after a warm discussion in the *American Sunday-school Union*, to place no limit in age either way. Then the Sunday-school, full-fledged, extended her wings of charity, and with one grand fraternal embrace, brought together the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the learned and the unlettered, as one common people, to labor for the same great end. Now what do we see in a Sunday-school chapel? Not a few penniless children from a pin-factory, but the aged sire and the darling babe—the grandmother and the flashing belle—the aristocrat and the humble tenant; and at one mere glance, we recognize the truth that “God is no respecter of persons.”

The methods of teaching in the various departments of the Sunday-school have, of course, sustained profitable changes. It has also become customary to hold children's meetings and monthly concerts. But among the most important of modern developments is that of the Sunday-school Missionary Work. This was made a specific object in the organization of the *American Sunday-school Union*. I have before me a report of a school that was organized by a missionary of the Union but two months after its organization. That school was in existence in 1874. Through the efforts of missionaries, during fifty years of their labors there were organized 61,299 schools, containing 2,650,787 scholars.

But the Sunday-school Union was not left alone in this work. Soon a society was formed with the children, called “*The Youth's Missionary Association*.” The two societies have practically the same object, to support missionaries, plant Sunday-schools in destitute sections, and aid in supplying poor schools with libraries. They have a corps of officers, hold monthly missionary meetings, and yearly anniversaries. The children are encouraged to earn the means that they contribute, so that while they are doing good, they are learning the great lesson of systematic beneficence.

I feel safe in saying that the missionary work has done more for the extension of Sunday-school instruction than any other agency before us. Thousands to-day are enjoying the

blessings of such instruction through the earnest labors of the Sunday-school missionaries.

The great convention movement of modern times is an interesting topic. It is not only a new move, but has been characterized by the development of good results. Many years had passed away with but little unity of action or mutual understanding, among the active workers in Sunday-schools. The board of officers and managers of the *American Sunday-school Union*, in their stated meeting, April 10, 1832, seeing the necessity of more unity of action, adopted a preamble and resolutions recommending a convention of the superintendents, teachers, and active workers in the Sunday-schools in the United States, to consider the management of the Sunday-school in its various departments. It was also proposed in the same paper to hold a primary convention on the 23d of May for the purpose of considering the propriety of a national convention.

In the primary convention, there were thirteen States and two Territories represented. All were pleased with the suggestion. The plan promised to be the early dawn of a bright and glorious day. It was resolved to call a National Convention to meet in the city of New York, October 3, 1832.

According to this call, the first *national convention* assembled. Two hundred and twenty delegates were present, representing fourteen States and two Territories. Seven of the popular religious denominations of the United States were represented in the delegation. Many topics of vital interest were considered. A careful review of the themes there discussed will clearly show the germ of the popular Sunday-school of to-day. This convention called a second convention, to meet at Philadelphia on May 22, 1833—appointed nine special committees, and adjourned *sine die*.

Among other important actions of this second convention, was a resolution requesting all the ministers of the gospel in the United States to preach a sermon to their respective congregations on the importance of Sunday-school work.

From causes too numerous to be introduced here, there was an intermission of the national convention for nearly twenty-seven years, during which time, however, State conventions

became quite popular. But in 1859, a third National Convention was held in Philadelphia; in 1868, a fourth in Newark, N. J., and in 1872, a fifth was convened in Indianapolis.

At these conventions it became customary to solicit corresponding delegations from foreign lands. This custom cultivated such a unity of feeling that at the fifth National Convention, it was proposed and enthusiastically carried, to call the next general gathering of Sunday-school workers an INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION, and thus extinguish all national boundaries. Therefore, on May 11, 1875, was assembled the first grand *International Convention* of the Sunday-school workers of the world. Here were assembled nearly five hundred delegates, from the Provinces of Canada and twenty-eight of the United States. Societies in Europe and other friends assembled in the Sunday-school cause, were either represented by letter or sent greetings by telegram. It was an inspiring occasion. The world in convention to work for JESUS!

I presume that an investigation of the origin and history of the *Uniform Sunday-school Lessons* would be an interesting topic to embrace in this sketch. I might say: The plan had its birth in the first National Convention; its zenith is, no doubt, yet in embryo, to be unfolded and developed in future progress. It may astonish some to know that this subject was discussed in the first National Convention. It was there warmly advocated to establish *Uniform Bible Classes*; and the plan suggested was that all the pupils commit to memory a verse a day—and all the same verse—and the seven verses thus committed should constitute the Bible Lesson for Sunday. But, more astonishing still, the announcement was made on the floor of that convention, that sixty thousand persons throughout the country were already pursuing that plan, while a weekly periodical was devoted to the elucidation of the texts! I am, therefore, unable to say where or with whom the plan primarily originated.

The desire for uniformity grew in intensity until the meeting of the fourth National Convention, in 1868. The greatest difficulty appears to have been in getting the different publishing houses to unite on a common series. To settle this

difficulty, was to perfect the plan. The aid of the Executive Committee of the National Convention was sought in furtherance of this plan. This committee held a meeting in New York, July 10, 1871, and after some discussion on the subject of uniformity, resolutions were adopted urging the importance of the work; and it was recommended that active efforts be made to introduce the uniform lessons in 1872. A part of this committee was appointed a sub-committee to confer with the different publishers and make known the sentiments of the committee, and propose such an assemblage of publishers as would lead to their co-operation in the great work before them.

The publishers thus called upon, met in conference in New York, Aug. 8, 1871, where the subject was discussed at considerable length. Some advocated the idea, others opposed it, while a third party were undecided in reference to it. It was finally voted to try the experiment for 1872, and a committee was appointed to arrange and announce the schedule of lessons. This committee at first could not come to an agreement, and voted to announce their inability to do so, and adjourned. After this, they reassembled, reconsidered, and agreed by a majority vote on a series of lessons, and published the list for 1872.

The conference of publishers, to which I referred, expressed a desire that the whole subject be considered fully at the next National Convention, in order that the general sentiment in reference to it might be more fully ascertained. They also recommended for consideration the plan of making a series of lessons for a number of years instead of for one year.

During the first quarter of 1872, the experiment proved to be more successful than its warmest friends had anticipated. The apparent difficulties gradually diminished, while its advantages were rapidly being manifested. The friends of the cause were inspired with hope, its enemies were convinced of their error, while the *quasi* advocates were confirmed in its favor.

In the call that was issued for the fifth National Convention, it was announced that "Foremost in importance and interest among the themes for discussion at that convention,

would be that of a system of Uniform Bible Lessons for the Sunday-schools of the land."

The interests of this convention culminated in the Uniform Lesson question. When it was brought before the body, an intensity of feeling is said to have been created that is rarely seen. At times the discussion would reach the morally sublime. The consideration of this topic occupied nearly a day. The final vote was almost unanimous. The announcement of the vote was greeted by the convention rising and singing,

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow."

At this (fifth) convention, a committee of five ministers and five laymen from different parts of the United States, with one minister and one layman added from the Dominion of Canada, was appointed to arrange a series of lessons for a term of seven years, covering a general study of the whole Bible. The convention also recommended the universal adoption of these lessons by the Sunday-schools of the land. This committee held several meetings, and succeeded in arranging a series of lessons for 1873; devoting half the year to the study of the Old Testament, and the other half to the study of the New Testament.

The London Sunday-school workers by this time had become impressed with the great American movement, and they also arranged a series of lessons for 1873. They were not identical with those arranged for America, but were very similar. The desire was potent that all the world be united on the same Bible lessons. Seeing the great importance of this, and desiring to approach as nearly as possible to immediate unity, the committee of the *London Sunday-school Union* made appropriate selections from the American Lessons, of a single text of Scripture for each week, and requested the American committee to regard these selections as *International Texts*. They were cordially received and adopted as *Golden Texts* of the American series of Uniform Lessons.

The unity of feeling, and the readiness with which the *International Golden Texts* were inaugurated, suggested and made popular the idea of the INTERNATIONAL LESSONS. In June, 1873, the first action was taken in reference to such a general union. The American committee on Uniform Les-

sons, learning that Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D., would soon visit England, passed a resolution to give him letters of commendation to the *London Sunday-school Union*, and to express through him a desire that the brethren of Great Britain would, as far as was consistent, co-operate with them in securing a uniform study of the Word of God.

When Dr. Vincent returned, he reported his cordial reception by the Union, and also that they expressed a deep interest in the work, adopted most of the lessons for 1874, and proposed co-operation in the future.

The American committee met again, February 4, 1874, at which time a communication was received from the *London Sunday-school Union*, showing their readiness to co-operate in the work, and thenceforth have uniformity in the lessons of both continents. Thus the little idea, germinated forty years ago, has developed into a great, glorious work. This system of uniformity is now the strongest ligament in the Christianized land. It is rapidly unifying the religious sentiments of the whole world. See the field over which it has spread in so short a time! These lessons are now used in France, Germany, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Turkey, Italy, and Greece; in Syria, Hindustan, India, Burmah, and China. Mexico and the Choctaw Indians are studying the same lessons. "Australia, New Zealand, and the Sandwich Islands have clasped hands with us across the intervening waters, and it is literally true that one set of Sabbath studies is going with the sun around the globe." Nearly four million separate papers or magazines relating to the International Lessons, were issued in 1874. These lessons have also reached the dust of the martyrs at old Rome, and week by week are being taught under the very shadow of St. Peter's. Side by side with the Vatican, they speak for Jesus.

What a work! What a work!! If the development of the Sunday-school has been such for the past few years—or half century—what will it be at the expiration of the next fifty years? This is a work the development of which is peculiar to our own times. Nobody has gone before us on this magnificent career; for it is literally true that there never

has been in the history of Christendom an enterprise that aimed at anything vaster; never an enterprise where God's blessings, in his providence and mercy, have so richly exceeded the hopes, and transcended the expectations of those engaged in launching it forth. The picture of the Sunday-school, as I comprehend its past, and gaze at the future, rises higher and higher in grandeur and glory, until in the heavenly visions it is completely involved in the effulgence of Divine light. Thousands will rise up *in that great day* and bless this instrumentality. How literally is it being fulfilled: "His dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the end of the earth." It is a great—it is a glorious work! It must, it shall prosper, for it is God's work, and "his work shall prosper in our hands."

NOTE.—I have not attempted to give direct quotations in this sketch, nor could I do so in many instances, as my information is the result of extensive reading on the subject; but I have merely used the ideas in their shortest form. I acknowledge indebtedness, however, to "The Rise and Progress of Sunday-schools," "Sunday-school Index," "Sunday-school Idea," "Sunday-school Teacher," "First Fifty Years of the Sunday school," "History and Work of the London Sunday-school Union," Reports of National Conventions, Thirty Years of Reports of the American Sunday-school Union, THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, and a number of tracts and pamphlets, the announcement of which would be too tedious.

ART. IV.—"*Increasing in the Knowledge of God.*"

THE question as to whether there is a God, is never raised in the Scriptures. From first to last, revelation proceeds upon the acknowledged belief that God exists, and that no additional proof is necessary. "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." If the proof in favor of the existence of God is so clear that none but a fool will doubt, and he not in word, but in thought only, why should theologians spend so much time and learning upon the subject? All the stupen-

dous miracles of Christ were insufficient to convince the Jews of his Messiahship; nor would they have been convinced had they been a thousand times greater. The fault was not in the character and sufficiency of the evidence, but in their own hearts. They were swayed by prejudice, interest, and passion. They were determined not to be convinced. They would not come to the light; they loved darkness better. The same is true with regard to the belief in the existence of God. If men deny this truth, it is not for want of sufficient evidence, but for want of will and right disposition.

If the proof common to all minds is rejected, any amount which might be added, we suppose, would be rejected also. Perhaps more thought and labor have been wasted in fruitless efforts to prove that "God is," than upon any other subject. To prove what no sane mind can reasonably deny, thousands of books have been written, and all the resources of logic exhausted. Our own THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM forms no exception. Some good brethren have done what they could to prove what none can reasonably deny—that there is a God. But after all, it may be doubted whether such labor has done more good than evil to the general cause of truth. He who denies that the sun exists, could not be convinced by any amount of proof. Who ever heard of an atheist being convinced by force of argument? And, indeed, is there not danger that such earnest efforts to establish a well-known truth, tends rather to confirm the skeptic in his skepticism? Might he not say to himself: "If the fundamental truth of all religion, a religion which is intended for all people, and of every grade, is so dark and uncertain as to demand so much labor to establish it, may it not after all be false?" If I were to stand props against my house because some one has said it is in danger of falling, although it is founded upon a rock, would not the passer-by conclude there was danger? The props would bring a reproach upon my house.

Atheism is a disease of the heart rather than of the head. The remedy must, therefore, be laid upon the heart. And that is just where the great Physician has placed it. "Make the tree good and the fruit will be good." A belief that there is a God is natural to the human mind; hence, all

men in all ages have cherished this belief. This is God's witness of himself, and is intended to unite and draw all men to himself. It is a part of our conscious being. It is axiomatic, and cannot be strengthened by argument. Atheism can exist only through a perversion of man's moral instincts, and is abnormal in its character. It is one development of depravity, and can be overcome, not by reason, not by argument, but by the pure, simple gospel, which is the power of God, the power of love, the power of the Holy Ghost.

But while a belief in the existence of God is natural, and needs no additional proof, a full and correct understanding of his attributes and character is exceedingly difficult to obtain. This is not the work of time only, but will, no doubt, be continued through all the ages of eternity. That the world by wisdom knew not God; that is to say, had no correct knowledge of his character, is evident from the vague and contradictory opinions of the wisest men of the most enlightened heathen nations.

Of these opinions we present a few. Thales, of Miletus, said: "That water was the principle of all things, that God is that intelligence by whom all things are formed out of water, that God pervades matter, and gives it motion in the same sense that the soul pervades the body of man and gives and directs its motions." According to this philosopher, the power of God did not extend to the work of creation out of nothing, but only to the formation of all things out of material already furnished to his hand.

Anaximander believed "That the gods received being, that they were born and die at remote periods of time, and that there are innumerable worlds."

Anaximenes affirmed "That the air is God, that it is produced, that it is infinite, and always in motion."

Anaxagoras, the pupil of Anaximenes, taught "That the system and order of the universe were to be attributed to the power and wisdom of an infinite mind."

This is a decided advance, and so far as it goes, speaks the truth as found in revelation. Perhaps some rays from the Hebrew Scriptures had fallen upon his mind. Here is an infinite mind, separate from matter, producing the order of

the universe, but without the power to create. The co-eternity of mind and matter, independent of each other as to their existence, is the rock on which he, with all the ancient philosophers, split.

Pythagoras believed "That God is a soul diffused throughout all the things of nature, and from which the souls of men are derived."

Xenophanes said "That God is an infinite whole, an eternal substance, of a round figure," by which he meant the world.

Empedocles taught "That the four elements—earth, air, fire, and water—were gods; that they have a beginning and will perish; that they are void of thought."

Democritus believed, or professed to believe, nothing. "I deny," said he, "that we either know any thing or nothing. I deny that we know even whether we know that. I deny that we know whether any thing exists or whether nothing exists."

Plato, it is believed, had purer thoughts of God than he dared to express. He says "That the Father of the world could not be named; that we should not be curious to know properly what God is." He believed God to be incorporeal. He attributed the formation of the universe to him; the world, the heavens, the stars, the souls of men; all this, he says, is God. Here is spiritualism, materialism, and polytheism, all compounded together. Yet, Rollin asserts the opinion that Plato was not a polytheist; that he believed in one most good and most perfect God who made all things.

Antisthenes says "That there are many gods adored by the nations of the earth, but that there is but one natural God, who is the author of all nature."

Aristotle differs exceedingly with himself. Sometimes he affirms that the whole divinity resides wholly in intelligence; that is, in the intelligent principle by which all thinking beings think; sometimes that the world is God. He afterwards discovers some other being who is above the world, and takes care to direct and preserve its motion. He elsewhere teaches that God is nothing else than the fire which burns in the heavens.

Xenocrates says "That there are eight gods. The planets are five; the fixed stars, as scattered members, make up but one god; the sun is the seventh, and, last of all, the moon is the eighth."

Theophrastus, in one passage attributes supreme divinity to intelligence, in another, to the heavens in general, and afterwards to the planets in particular.

Strato says "There is no other God but nature; and that nature is the principle of all productions, and all mutations."

Zeno, the celebrated founder of the sect of the Stoics, taught "That the four elements alone composed the whole of the universe; that these four elements make but one continued nature without division; that absolutely no other substance exists besides these four elements; that the source of intelligence and of all souls is the fire united in the ether where its purity suffers no alteration, because the other elements do not mingle with it; that this intelligent, active, vital fire penetrates the whole universe; that this intelligence operates all things; that it proceeds methodically to generation: that is to say, it produces all things, not blindly and by chance, but according to certain rules always the same; that being the soul of the universe, it causes it to subsist, and governs it with wisdom, because it is the principle of all wisdom; that, consequently, it is God; that the sun, moon, and all the stars, as they are bodies of fire, are gods; that the same title ought also to be given to great men in whose souls this divine fire brightens with uncommon lustre; that all objects in which fire exists are to be worshiped."

What a compound of absurdities and contradictions do we find in the opinions of these philosophers! No two of them agree. Not one of them was able to ascend to the pure spiritual idea of God. One asserts that water is God, another that fire is God, and still another that it requires all the four elements combined to constitute God. Some assert that matter is God, others that God is a vital energy pervading all matter. One asserts that there are many gods; that they are born and die as men, with the only difference that they live longer. Those who believed in the eternity of the gods, believed also in the eternity of matter. Some allowed that

God had put the world in order and system, but not one believed that God could create something out of nothing. Some believed in the providence of God over the world, while others denied his providence altogether. Some believed that God is good without any mixture of evil, others that he is composed of good and evil, as we find in man, while most of them believed in two eternal principles, the one good and the other evil. These, as was supposed, stood in eternal opposition, sometimes one prevailing, then the other; hence, the mixture of good and evil which we find in the world.

In this confused state of things, any one may see that to form a uniform and correct system of morals was impossible. Each one would aim to present a system according to the views he entertained of the character of God. As these were almost infinite, so would be their systems of moral conduct.

The character of God as revealed in the Scriptures: Hitherto, the mind has been out at sea, lost amid the storms and darkness. Now, the light shines and all is calm. Although we can see neither shore nor bottom, yet the waters are transparent and we feel the sailing is safe. While in revelation, as we have seen, there are no arguments employed to prove the existence of God; nor is there any elaborate and systematic presentation of his character, such as human reason would have suggested, yet enough is revealed to serve all the wants of the soul in the present state. The theologian, struggling to combine his thoughts, has said "That God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable, in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth." Perhaps a better definition cannot be given, save the one given by the Spirit himself: "God is love." This is shorter and sweeter, and meets, much more fully, the present wants of the soul than the other. As in nature, science has discovered a power which puts all the material universe in motion, and draws all to a common center, so in the vast domain of morals, revelation has made known to us a corresponding power; it is the power of love. This power is intended, and well calculated, to put all in motion, and draw all to a common center. That center is God, and God is love.

Let us elaborate the thought. Negative proof: There is no element in the divine character in conflict with this great truth. God is just. But what is justice more than love always doing right? Justice is one of the brightest adornments of any character in the grand sweep from man up to God. While it injures no one, it gives to all their dues. It belongs to our being to approve the right and condemn the wrong. Justice and truth are the habitation of the eternal throne, the foundation of God's government, the only reliable pledge of security and happiness. As God loves the highest and eternal well-being of his children, so he deals with them according to truth and justice. A government is no less loving because it is just, but just because it is loving. There can be no war between love and justice. They always act in concert, and dwell together in great harmony. God is merciful. But what is mercy but love doing good to the undeserving? God is omniscient. But what is omniscience more than love watching over and providing for the well-being of all? God is omnipotent. But what is omnipotence more than all-powerful love working for the highest interests of all, protecting the innocent, restraining the wayward, and, for the general good, punishing the ill-deserving? God is omnipresent. But what is omnipresence more than universal love, at work every where in all parts of God's dominion, for the highest and eternal interests of the whole? God is eternal. But what is the eternity of God but love ever full, always at work, never growing weary?

All the perfections of God exist in infinite and eternal harmony. In that boundless ocean of love there are no counter-currents, no adverse winds. It is an eternal calm, alike undisturbed by any thing within or any thing without!

With God, love is not just the same as with man. With man, love is often blinded by passion, warped by prejudice, or corrupted by interest. It is not so with God. With him, love is an eternal principle of good-will, unchanged by time or circumstances, and uninfluenced by passion, prejudice, or interest.

In each pencil of light there are many colors. These may be divided and viewed separately. Again, they may be blended,

when nothing is seen but white. So, in the character of God, there are many perfections or attributes. Such is the limited power of our mental conceptions, that we are compelled to view them separately. In this way, different ideas are raised. But should the period ever come in the future history of the soul, when it can rise up to the grand conception of God as a unit, absolute and indivisible, then nothing will be seen but love.

In the grand march of providence, there is nothing, when properly understood, in conflict with the idea that God is love. True, sometimes God seems to be severe. But in all such cases the facts vindicate his course as tending towards the highest interest of his universal government. The rebellious angels were turned out of heaven and shut up in hell. This was a fearful punishment, but what else could God do? Shall he allow them to remain in heaven and treat them as in the past? Would not this be to encourage rebellion? Thus protected by the great Sovereign, might it not extend to other parts of his empire, and even sap the foundations of his throne? And more, still: they had disqualified themselves for the enjoyment of God and the society of the good. The congeniality had been broken up. In their fallen state, they would prefer any other place than heaven; any other companionship than that of God and the remaining holy angels. And again: having voluntarily rebelled against their great Sovereign, they had no right to expect the same treatment as before, and, had it been extended, encouragement would not only have been given to rebellion, but all distinction between obedience and disobedience, right and wrong, obliterated. Indeed, we cannot see how God could have acted otherwise than he did. Turning the rebel-angels out of heaven was love asserting and protecting the universal good.

The very same may be said of the course pursued with Adam and Eve in the garden. We feel safe in saying that God did all he could, according to the just principles of his government and the freedom of the human mind, to secure them in obedience. He had created them in his own image, in purity and knowledge; warned them against doing what they did, and told them the fearful results of disobedience,

while they were already realizing the happy results of obedience, with an eternity of bliss before them. Was not this all that God, as a moral governor, could do? The facts show, also, that after they had sinned, they ceased to desire the presence of God; they even vainly attempted to hide themselves from him. The guilt, consequent upon their sin, was a fit warning against repeating the act, as is true of the guilt of all sin. Love itself could have done no more than turn them out of the garden, and thus vindicate God's sovereign power, set his seal of disapprobation upon sin, and rightly discriminate between obedience and disobedience.

But all were involved in the consequences of Adam's sin. How can we reconcile this with the idea that God is love? 1. No one will be eternally condemned for Adam's sin; only for his own. 2. We are offered more in Christ than we lost in Adam. Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.

But during the entire earthly existence of man as a sinner, he is doomed to incessant labor, great suffering, and the pangs of death, followed by the entire dissolution of the body. Is this the appointment of love? We answer: 1. If God is love, as we have seen, then all his appointments are prompted by love. We may not always be able to see just how this can be; but is not this just what might be expected? Can man by searching find out God? Can the finite comprehend the infinite? His footsteps are in the deep waters; he has drawn a cloud about his throne. If the reason for much of what the parent does is concealed from the child, need we be surprised that the reason of much which God does is dark and unknown to us? 2. So limited is the range of our mental vision, that a single point in God's providence is all that we can comprehend at once. Both ends of the chain are lost in darkness. To judge correctly of one single event, is to know perfectly its direct and remote connection with, and bearing upon, all other events. This, every one knows, is impossible. As I look upon the sufferings and death of a little babe, my lips are closed. I have no satisfactory explanation to give. But shall I arraign God, whose ways I cannot comprehend? There is mystery connected with all human suffering. But

until we can comprehend the whole of God's plan, and know the bearing of each part upon the grand whole, even human reason suggests that we decide cautiously. If we speak at all in regard to human suffering in the present state, so far as it is an appointment of God, we would say, it connects itself with the great redemptive system which had its rise in the infinite love of our Great Father. It is love restraining, reforming, and training the soul for eternal happiness in heaven. "Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

What are the ten commandments but love defining duty, opening the way of happiness, and presenting lofty motives to obedience?

What is penalty but love condemning, restraining, and punishing sin, not only because it deserves to be punished, but also with a view to the reformation of the sinner and the protection of the good?

What is hell but love exhausted, yielding, confining, protecting?

No one will be excluded from heaven who desires, on proper principles, to enter there. No one will be banished into outer darkness who does not love darkness rather than light. The ripe sinner hates no one so much as Christ. See how the wicked Jews treated him when on earth. To be compelled to stand forever in his presence would, to such, be of all hells the most intolerable. When Christ shall appear at the last day, the cry of the wicked will be, Rocks and mountains fall on us, and hide us from the face of the Lamb! If, from the judgment plain, every door in heaven were thrown wide open, and every sinner were left to his own choice, it is doubtful whether one would desire to enter. How is it now? Do not the doors of salvation stand open night and day? Are not the arms of love and earnest pleadings extended to the wandering prodigal, from youth to old age? Does not the pressing call of the great and loving Father, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come to the waters and drink," sound in the ears of every perishing sinner? And yet how few express the least desire to return and live! In this world,

God leaves all men to the freedom of choice. It is his will that they repent and live. To incline their wills, he gives them his Spirit, and presents the strongest possible motives, and yet how few feel inclined to put themselves in the way of salvation? Would those who love the world and sin here more than God and virtue, enjoy heaven if they were there? Would those who love the dance, the intoxicating bowl, and all sensual pleasure, more than the sanctuary, the preaching of the word, the songs of Zion, and the worship of God on earth, enjoy the songs of the redeemed amidst the moral splendors of the New Jerusalem? Heaven is a place, but much more a state. So is hell. If Paul could praise God in the dungeon, so he could in hell. Heaven was inside of him. Judas hanged himself that he might go to his own place; that is to say, the place for which he was prepared; the only place in the universe adapted to his vile nature; the place where, in all probability, he is less miserable than he would or could be anywhere else. Perhaps the same is true of all who do not go to heaven. The future world will be the harvest season both of the righteous and the wicked. Each will reap what he hath sown; each will be confirmed in his own voluntary choice; each will remain forever in the character formed while on probation. As with many on earth, so in hell, there, perhaps, will be no desire to change. It is clear from the above facts, that there is no antagonism between the truth that "God is love" and the doctrine of a hell. God, we suppose, has done the best he could; has confirmed them in their own decisions, and assigned them a place, of all others, best suited to their depraved natures; while at the same time he, no doubt, has an eye to the repose of the good, who will no more be disturbed by the wicked. Could love do more? Of course, we do not undertake to go to the bottom of this momentous subject; to vindicate all the ways of God to man. The mist which enshrouds the mind in the present state is too dense, the range of mental vision too limited. We hope to rise to a higher realm hereafter, where what is now seen through a glass darkly, will be seen through the clearer light of an unclouded vision.

Positive proof that "God is love:" That God is love will

appear when we consider what he is doing to supply our physical and spiritual wants. Love is always active. Such is its nature. It fixes its eyes upon its object and never tires in blessing it. The Bible teaches that God is the author of all the good we enjoy. Those who exclude God from nature, are as unphilosophic as they are atheistic. There is no life in matter; no will or power of motion. Matter is essentially inert. It moves simply as operated by a force outside of itself, and greater than itself. Nor is there, *per se*, any power in law. What philosophers call the law of matter possesses no more power than matter itself. All laws presuppose a law-giver and a law-administrator. Without these there can be no law. Science talks to us about the power of attraction. But what is attraction but the power which God exerts on matter? But how is it, then, that it acts so uniformly and so constantly? We answer simply: such are the ways of God; he acts uniformly and constantly. Shall we conclude that he does not act at all, simply because he acts uniformly? Does the earth revolve on its axis daily, and thus cause alternate day and night? Forgetting God, science says this is done by the power of attraction. Acknowledging God, the Christian philosopher says it is the hand of God which turns it over for the good of man. The same is true of its annual revolution round the sun, with its endless variety of seasons, beauty, and life. Shall we say there is a mutual dependence and mutual influence reigning over and amongst all worlds? Yes. But what is this but the power of God exhibiting the glory of his own essential unity, in the unity of all worlds, each dependent upon the other, and all upon God? It is God who pours the light and heat of the sun upon the earth, that causes the vapors to ascend from the bosom of the great ocean, forms the clouds and sends the rain. The Scriptures uniformly teach that it is God who makes the grass to grow, the trees to bring forth fruit, the herds to increase, the winds to blow, the waters to flow, and the thunder to utter its voice; that God is the source of all life and the giver of all blessings; that it is "in him we live, move, and have our being." Such is the great truth as made known to us in revelation; and when revealed, the only true philosophy of the world utters its

voice in its defense. Science will never go beyond this, and when she stops short, she loses herself in darkness. If there is no power in matter, what then is it that put the world, all worlds, in motion, and keeps them in motion so long? There can be but one answer to this question. It is the power of God. No other power is adequate. If, then, God does all this, and, in doing all this, sustains me every moment, and with his own hand supplies my daily wants, is he not good? Does he not love me? And if he does the same to all who live upon the earth, then is not the whole earth full of his glory, and should not all the people praise him? With the eye of sense, I cannot see God, but with the eye of faith, I see him everywhere, and in every event in any wise connected with the history of my life. He is on my right hand and on my left, above, beneath, and all around me. Even when I forget him he is thinking of me; when I am ungrateful, he keeps on blessing me; and when I sin against him, he does not cease to love me.

God does not manifest himself to all alike. Those who have much faith see him much more clearly; those who have little faith, see him dimly; those who have no faith, do not see him at all. Hence, some see God in every thing; some see him in nothing. Sin is a cloud drawn over the soul; it shuts God out from sight. When we accept Christ by faith, that cloud is removed. "The pure in heart shall see God." As we advance in holiness, so will our knowledge of God increase. But perfect holiness is not attainable in this life. We will have to wait till we get to heaven before we can see God as he is. Here we see through a glass darkly; then we will see him face to face. Here we know in part; then shall we know even as we are known. All that is meant by seeing God, may not be known in this life. It is doubtless one of those sweet experiences which must be realized to be understood. In the future world, we shall see him as he is, and because we shall see him as he is, we shall be like him. In this world we see him, but not as he is. God is a pure spirit, without body or parts. As such, we cannot see him now. We can only see him mediately, through signs and symbols. Of a pure spirit we can form no image or picture—not even a

mental conception. When we look upon the picture of Washington, we say "That is George Washington." But what artist can draw a picture of a spirit? In the present state, all our knowledge is derived through our bodily senses. But upon these, spirits do not, perhaps cannot, operate. Then it follows as a truth, that all our knowledge of God, in the present state, must be through some material representation. And it is just in this way that God has made himself known to man. It was always in this way that he showed himself to the patriarchs. Sometimes he appeared as a man, speaking and acting; then as a pillar of cloud, protecting and leading the hosts of Israel through the wilderness, and permanently, as a cloud of visible glory above the mercy-seat.

The various rites and ordinances of the temple-service were intended to serve the same purpose; that is, to lift the mind, by means of the material, up to the conception of the spiritual or immaterial God. The same is true of the present ordinances of the Church. These are preaching, modes of worship, the Lord's supper, and baptism. These are less numerous and far more simple than the Church rites of the old dispensation, for the reason, no doubt, that the world had made progress; the Church, by degrees, had become more spiritual and did not need all the helps of the past. Teachers of children have long since learned the use of pictures; as the mind matures, pictures are not so greatly needed. In the New Jerusalem, which John saw, and which is the Church fully redeemed from earth and sin, there was no temple, no altar, no sacrifices. In that advanced state of absolute perfection, the mind will need no such helps.

The most perfect manifestation of God ever made to man, as appealing to his senses, is found in the person of Christ. He is "God manifest in the flesh." It is an appeal to our senses, the most powerful that could be made. It is God in Christ reconciling the world to himself. We see God in the miracles which he wrought, in the doctrines which he taught, and in the purity and grandeur of his life. Now when we think of God, we think of him in Christ; when we pray to God, we pray to him in Christ. Henceforth the mind has something to rest upon; there is a direct appeal to our senses.

It is a material image with a spiritual effect. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "No man knoweth who the Father is but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." Luke x. 22.

Our knowledge of God, as gained through visible representations, is vastly extended through the operations of faith. Our bodily senses have to do with the material and the visible: faith with the immaterial and spiritual. As sight is to the body, so is faith to the mind. As sense surrounds us with a great variety of material things with which we stand connected, so faith places us in the midst of a spiritual universe, surrounded by an innumerable host of spirits, both good and bad, and with which we stand, more or less, closely connected. While science appeals to sense and deals only in facts, faith rests upon the word of God; believes because God has spoken. While science always demands a reason and an explanation, faith believes God without demanding a reason. Who can understand how the sea was divided, or the walls of Jericho fell? While knowledge, gained through the senses, is very limited, and often imperfect, faith is limited only by the word and power of God, and the knowledge gained in this way is of far more exalted nature, and stamps much higher convictions of truth upon the mind. The knowledge of faith is experimental, and, therefore, more satisfactory. With the eye of faith I see God, and in my heart I feel his presence. The language of faith is, "Taste and see that the Lord is good." "To them who believe, he is precious." Faith reveals Christ to the soul, trusting in him as the "chief among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely." Our faith in science may be shaken, but our faith in the existence, peace, and love of God, cannot be shaken by all the arguments which can be brought to bear against it. In the possession of this knowledge, the simplest Christian can defy all the arts of the wisest skeptic. The man who beholds the sun, and feels his heat, would simply laugh to scorn the man who is simple enough to tell him there is no sun.

The knowledge of God, as seen by the eye of faith, is the highest promised to man in his present state. It is well calculated to meet all our present wants; to keep our eyes on

God and heaven, and give us the victory over all our spiritual enemies. Still, we stand in expectation—are looking and longing. How much more of God the future world will reveal, we cannot tell. Revelation has made known much of God and heaven, but here it stops by the simple declaration: “It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.” This is all that can be desired. Beyond this we would not go if we could. To be like God! What a world of thought in this short sentence! To be as God is, to feel as God feels, to see as God sees, to know in the way that God knows, to love as God loves: this is enough!

“I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also.”

ART. V.—*The Origin of Language.—Part I.*

IS THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE A PHYSICAL SCIENCE?

WITHIN the last quarter of a century theories of the origin of language have been propounded by scientists. Each of these theories claims to be a scientific exhibit of the subject, and fortifies itself behind the bristling ramparts of modern physical discovery. To examine and criticise these systems within a limited compass, and in the light of recognized linguistic facts, is the design of these articles. In their preparation I have had access to the shelves of Yale College Library. Though authors of minor mention have been consulted, I have made the works of Professors Max Muller and Whitney my constant companions in study. While it would be mere presumption for me to arrogate to myself that extensive knowledge of the languages which has given these renowned professors their deserved fame, I am encouraged to pursue

the path of criticism by the truthful remark of Muller, that an acquaintance with many languages is not an indispensable prerequisite to correct judgment in comparative philology. Muller is a fine example of his own remark. Equalled by no living linguist in ascertaining facts, and in bringing to light the unnoticed and neglected phenomena of linguistic science, his generalizations are still notably faulty. Whitney's excellence, on the other hand, lies not so much in his linguistic acquirements as his critical judgment. As a generalizer, he occupies, perhaps, the highest place among living scholars. With these allusions to the scope of the article, and the sources of information resorted to in its preparation, I pass to the subject itself.

At the outset, it is not out of place to mention several necessary cautions. The object of a generous criticism is neither dogmatism nor despair. Dogmatism comes of word-victories and philological janglings, and, in fact, is nothing more than stubborn ignorance clothed with presumption. Despair of arriving at a satisfactory termination of inquiry, is more honest and praiseworthy, and results from the mind being directed to the contrariety and clash of human opinions, rather than to independent thought upon that stratum of truth which always underlies the discussions of scientists. Dogmatism shuts off investigation; despair paralyzes the investigator. True criticism is of thought and not of word. By an analytical sifting of theories, it designs to separate fact from conjecture, the known from the undiscovered, the knowable from the unknowable, and thus indicate the present state of information with regard to any particular question, as well as point out the lines of inquiry along which the research of the future may or may not be successful. It has a warm appreciation of what has been done, and only hopes, by pointing out the failures of the past, to secure the victories of the future. That criticism which breaks open the sepulchres of private character that it may feast upon sickening decay, may well be termed the vulture of the literary world. "For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the vultures be gathered together." True criticism enables us to profit by the experience of past endeavor. This age boasts of its labor-saving

machinery. Would that it, also, boasted of its study-saving apparatus! A preliminary critical survey of the field will, in some sort, present to our mental vision the salient points of attack, and lead to cautious and systematic approaches. This survey every man must make for himself. To appropriate other men's labors, except under the limitations of criticism, is to don the lion's skin without the lion's heart. A model with servility, is incomparably worse than no model at all. The caution thus thrown out is applicable to all investigation, and I give it, not so much for its relation to the matter in hand, as for its own inherent importance.

Another caution relates to the desire to be thought original. In linguistic science, the ambitious writer is precluded from making new conjectures, from the fact that almost every possible hypothesis has already been advanced. The recent theories of Muller, Black, Farrar, and Steinthal, are but restatements of the older systems. It is not by singular conjecture or happy imaginative flights, that the problem of the origin of language may hope to be solved. We must proceed with cautious comparison of facts and rigid application of known principles. We can afford to be dogmatic only when absolutely sure of our conclusions. As a matter of fact, men do not become dogmatic after investigation, but begin investigation to support dogma. But what is originality? Is it conjecture? Is it a recasting of old theories? Or, rather, is it not logical deduction from facts? Shakespeare, from the facts of human consciousness, constructed those wondrous plays which sweep every cord and string of the soul. Newton was an original thinker, yet Kepler and Tycho Brahe furnished him much of his material. The German student receives his philosophical doctorate and a professorship when he presents an approved thesis. Dr. Martin Luther wrote on a common head of divinity, and his productions, even with the elaboration of after years, are no longer deemed the best exponents of scriptural truth. Still, Luther was, in every proper sense, original. His originality consisted in founding his teachings on the facts of the Bible, rather than on current statements of those facts. Luther discovered no new truths, but presented a new classification of old truths. In his sys-

tem, justifying faith assumed its proper place, and caused a revolution in theological thought and practical life. To state my idea in different phraseology, correct generalization is a finer test of originality than the discovery of isolated truths. The discoverer of a fact is an artisan, contributing a stone to the building, while the generalizer is the architect, under whose skill and direction the temple of science assumes its massive and harmonious proportions. The one is the private soldier, striking, it may be, blows quick and hard for his country; the other the leader, under whose marshaling each individual effort tells on the success of the campaign. How much more important and responsible the work of the one than that of the other! If the stone-cutter spoil his work, the fragments may be used by Macadam in paving our streets, but the false system, like the great misshapen monument of Washington, speaks a misconceived and misspent purpose. In a correct generalization, all related truth is harmonious and complete. In a false system, truth is distorted and foreshortened as a figure in an imperfect mirror. Few men have been more laborious and successful in investigations and experiments than the senior Darwin, yet, as a systemizer, his conclusions are manifestly based on hasty generalizations and false analogies, and reveal the antecedent bias of their author. From the descent of species he infers, by analogy, the descent of genera. He does not claim as a fact of observation, that genera are mutable and evolutionary, but argues solely from the observed mutability and commingling of species, that the same must be true, also, of genera. But the radical distinction and difference between species and genera, are such that the analogical argument has no force. That all animals have life, sensation, and motion, does not prove that they originally descended from a common protoplasmatic monad. Instead of writing a book against Darwin, it is sufficient to say, "more facts, more facts!" The phrase, "original research," as understood by many at the present time, is simply the laying of a premium on strange and fanciful perversions. When, by originality, we shall understand a broad and comprehensive grasping of facts, and the placing of them as finished stones in their appropriate niches in the great temple of the

sciences, we shall have done much toward the introduction of a healthier system of inquiry. Of all sciences, that of language has most to hope from such a change.

It is of utmost importance in the beginning of our investigations to ascertain within what limits our researches must be made, and with what materials we are to deal. What is the nature of the science of language? Is it a physical or a historical science? If it be a physical science, the elements of human freedom and progress, as related to it, are to be excluded from the account. But if, on the other hand, it be a historical science, the advancement of language toward perfection is inseparably connected with the development of the race. The decision of this inquiry has, furthermore, an important bearing on the origin of language. Language, as a physical science, is entirely disconnected from human history, either as to its origin or evolution. As a historical product, it originated in mind, and it depends for its progress on mental activity. Prof. Max Muller, of England, is the champion of the physical-science theory of language. Prof. Whitney rather inclines to the same view, but does not take such positive ground as Muller. Muller fills up twenty-five octavo pages with his defense of the physical nature of linguistic science. I propose to give his plea a patient examination. "There are two great divisions of human knowledge, which, according to their subject-matter, are called physical and historical. Physical science deals with the works of God; historical science with the works of man." Regarding language as a production of nature, and not a work of art, he claims for it the rank and title of a physical science. He passes lightly over the difficult part of the question; namely, whether from recognized facts it can be proved that language is or is not a physical science. After we have determined the exact nature of a study, its classification is not a difficult task. The fault of Muller is that he classifies, and then attempts to defend his work. He says: "In claiming for language a place among the physical sciences, I was prepared to meet with many objections. The circle of physical sciences seemed closed, and it was not likely that a new claimant should be at once welcomed among the established branches and scions

of the ancient aristocracy of learning." He magnifies the opposition that he may appear the greater hero. Has he forgotten that geology is as young in years as the science of language, and that Colebrooke, the pioneer in Sanskrit philology, was the contemporary of Hugh Miller? By a skillful rhetorical turn, he would have the reader believe that prejudice from the "scions of the ancient aristocracy of learning," and not the inherent difficulties of the subject, barred the admission of language as a physical science. In fact, the objection raised by scientists is that language is, in some respects, at least, the work of man, and, therefore, cannot be ranked as a physical science. Language was invented by man as a means of communicating thought when mere looks and gestures proved inefficient, and was, by the combined efforts of succeeding generations, brought gradually to that perfection which we admire in the great master-pieces of all languages. To this Muller replies: "Now, it is perfectly true, that if language be the work of man, in the same sense in which a statue, or a temple, or a poem, are properly called the works of man, the science of language would have to be classed as a historical science." We might have a history of language, as we have a history of poetry and of jurisprudence, but we could not claim for it a place side by side with the various branches of natural history. Muller is conscious that the leading thinkers, both of the last and the present century, are strongly opposed to the idea of language as a physical science. A few voices, it is true, have protested against the human invention of language, but they were zealous, not in the defense of science, but in advocacy of the doctrines supposed to be required by the account in Genesis. Language was regarded as being as much a divine creation as man himself. Here is a fitting opportunity for our author to show us the true basis upon which he rests his favorite idea of language as a physical science. He passes on, however, by reminding his readers, "It is the object of these lectures to prove that language is not a work of human art." In all his subsequent allusions to the subject, he takes it for granted that he has already given the necessary proof. I am fearful that Muller must turn out still another volume

of "Chips from a German Workshop," ere he satisfies a critical public.

A second objection to the doctrine of Muller is brought forward by scientists. Whatever may have been the origin of language, it has been remarked, with a strong appearance of truth, that language has a history of its own, like law or religion; and that, therefore, the science of language belongs to the historical, or, as they used to be called, the moral, in contradistinction from the physical sciences. Nature is incapable of progress or improvement. Dr. Whewell says: "Natural history, when systematically treated, excludes all that is historical, for it classes objects by their permanent and universal properties, and has nothing to do with the narration of particular or casual facts." Now, if we eliminate from language its particular phases assumed under limited conditions of time and circumstance, and treat the remaining unchangeable principles, if such there be, as a science, it will be at once apparent that our course has cut off so much of the material of study, that we may well doubt the legitimacy of the process. Language, proceeding down through the centuries, as if from a common point of radiation, and dividing itself according to the ethnological and tribal relations of the race, seems as instinct with life as humanity itself. Ethnology might as well be termed a physical science as language. There is unmistakable evidence of human will-power in linguistic development.

Muller answers all this by stating that there are some features in language which man cannot change at will. Though there is a continuous change in language, it is not in the power of man to produce or to prevent it. We must distinguish between historical change and natural growth. Art, science, philosophy, and religion, all have a history; language, or any other production of nature, only has a growth. This growth is from within, and is independent of external surroundings. Muller says: "We might as well think of changing the circulation of our blood, or of adding an inch to our stature, as of altering the laws of speech, or of inventing new words at pleasure." Man becomes the lord of language, if he only knows its laws and obeys them. "Try to alter the smallest

rule of English, and you will find it physically impossible." Tiberius could not give an upstart-word Roman citizenship. The Emperor Sigismund could not change "schisma" from neuter to feminine gender by his royal mandate. Muller sweeps on through the subsequent lectures of his First Series, with the triumphant air of one who had at last reached the ultimate truths of science. He, however, evidently runs into the mistake that man can make nothing that he cannot change at will. He forgets, also, that it is not the individual but society that makes language, and he further supposes that any individual may change any of the historical sciences in some of its rules or peculiarities. These suppositions are not true. Painting and sculpture are manifestly of human origin. As they proceed upon settled principles of art, they may be called sciences, and, according to Muller, they are pre-eminently historical sciences. Following his reasoning, man may change the rules of these sciences at pleasure. Such, however, is not the case. In old painting the figures appear foreshortened in the prospective. A new principle remedied this defect, not by displacing the old, but by combining with it in producing that result of harmony of figure and distance which is always seen in nature's great paintings. Muller would cry out that a change has taken place in the rules of the canvas. In fact, there was no change, but simply a correct application of all the principles of light and shade and distance in producing a natural effect. The radical and unchangeable principles of painting are as numerous and well-marked as those of language, yet no scholar contends that painting is a physical science. The changes of the canvas are not in developing new rules, but in a more extended and various application of the essential rules of the art. Muller defends his view by an allusion to the futile efforts of royalty. We, also, have a classic illustration. When Michael Angelo was ordered by the Pope to rush through with his work on the dome of the Sistine Chapel, he replied that if the Pope wanted mere daubing he must apply to some one else. The terrors of papal displeasure could not expedite the slow, pains-taking processes of the artist. The Pope could not abolish the rules of art any more than Sigismund could

change the gender of a word. And yet society, by gradual usage or by arbitrary changes, may impose new forms or significations upon words. It is evident that changes in language must be gradual. The liability to sudden mutations grows less and less with the civilizing progress of its speaking population. "Schisma" had been for two thousand years the servant of the people, and it was the grammarian and not the word that opposed the imperial command.

The least change in language is "physically impossible." Let us look at this impossibility. A thing is physically impossible for man when he has not the strength to accomplish it. It is morally impossible when his will cannot be brought to bear upon its achievement. In the first case, the difficulty is in the thing itself; in the second, it is in the human will. "Schisma" is proposed to be changed from neuter to feminine. The word opposes no objection. The difficulty is in persuading the people to adopt the change. The word in question ceased to be a spoken term with the destruction of its nationality. Still, Muller says to effect the smallest change is "physically impossible." The truth is, that there is no impossibility, either moral or physical, about such modifications of language.

Muller's argument has two general faults. He is full of the idea that if language can be changed by man, then the science is capricious and unsettled. Hence he classes it as a physical science. History is not capricious, though it be an account of human caprice. Language, as in some sort a human product, embraces in itself, without fear or favor, the actual terms with which men express ideas. The fears of Muller cannot change the facts. His second fault is in teaching that language admits only of natural growth. In nature, nothing grows but that which has life and vital functions. The tree appropriates to itself through its digestive apparatus, the nourishment of the soil and the air, and flourishes by an inherent life. Language, aside from its speaking population, is cold, impassive, dead. Nature does not grow. She merely modifies and changes her constituent particles. Language both changes its forms and grows by the addition of new material. Nature builds up one part by destroying another.

Language may develop simultaneously in all directions. The fact that language only modifies itself under human influence, may be presented as a sufficient answer to all the allegations of Muller. Language has no inherent life, and hence, no natural growth.

Is language a physical science? If the objections to Muller are well taken, there can be but one answer. While there may be points of resemblance in all sciences, the science of language may be safely classed among the historical sciences.

I come now to the view of Prof. Whitney as to whether the science of language is historical or physical. He makes no labored argument on the subject, but states briefly that all evidence as to the origin of language must be excluded, except that which is found in language itself. "This, on the one hand, excludes the admission as co-ordinate evidence of all opinion by whomsoever or at whatsoever time expressed; and of all authoritative statement, traditional or other, and on whatsoever authority reported. Nothing but harm and confusion can come from attempting to combine the hints of Genesis, for example, with the deductions of science in order to yield a joint conclusion; or from suffering the one to govern or regulate the other." He brings forward no proof beyond personal assertions as to the physical nature of linguistic science. Having already seen that the weight of argument is on the side of the historical nature of the science, I feel warranted in criticising the paragraph above quoted. If the science of language is historical, and there is no proof to the contrary, we must carefully weigh all historic opinions and traditions as to the origin of language. The Ptolemaic system of astronomy is not to be rejected because it is a classic presentation of the subject, but because it has been demonstrated to be false. Because astronomy is a physical science, Whitney would reject the Ptolemaic theory in the very beginning of his studies. Copernicus, however, arrived at the correct system through long study of the Ptolemaic. If physical science reaches perfection through a reception and careful weighing of former opinions, how much more must historical science depend on the same means of progress? Prof. Whitney would not follow his rule in any other depart-

ment of investigation. He would not reject all geological information, to survey the field anew for himself. He seems to have constructed his language with special reference to avoiding the testimony of the Scriptures. Whether the Bible be a divine revelation or not, it is accredited history. Both Muller and Whitney prove their assumptions by referring to the observations of missionaries among uncultivated tribes. Why, then, cast aside the oldest and most authoritative reference to the origin of language? Both the authors cited, throughout their works, practically recognize the historical nature of language. Whitney finds almost all his arguments for his theory of language, not in the internal testimony of word-roots, but in the observed facts attending the acquisition of speech. The uncompromising opposition of Muller to the admission of language as a historical science, is strangely at war with his actual treatment of the subject. Both have demonstrated the impossibility of regarding language as a pure physical science.

It may be asked, why we have given so much space to the discussion of a mere preliminary question. Materialistic philosophy fortifies itself behind the doctrine of the physical nature of the science of language. If language, the most spiritual of the external characteristics of humanity, be simply a physical development, without the intervention of mental activities, the transition is easy to the belief that mind itself is a materialistic production. Correlated with the problem of the origin of language, are the doctrines of the unity of the human race and its common descent. If language be not historical, it cannot be argued that it throws any light on the subject. In short, the decision of the pending inquiry in favor of the historical nature of the science, is a death-blow to certain phases of rationalistic philosophy, while at the same time it opens the way for a reconciliation of science and the Bible.

In the further progress of these articles, I will notice in detail the various theories of the origin and growth of language, and present what I conceive to be the true doctrine, so far as discovered facts warrant a conclusion.

ART. VI.—*Communion.*

THERE is, perhaps, no one subject about which the people of God differ, that it is more important that they should be united upon, than that of the communion of the saints at the Lord's table; yet there is none where, it is likely, that there is more division. It is extremely unfortunate for those professing to love and follow the Saviour, as well as for the success of the gospel and the salvation of souls, that such is the case. There evidently is wrong somewhere, for the Saviour did not, as we believe, intend that such schisms should exist among his people; and when he said, "Drink ye all of it"—"This do in remembrance of me," he did not design that his people should so differ upon this subject that any of them should debar others from thus honoring their Lord. My object in this article shall be to examine the grounds of these differences among God's people, and ascertain, if I can, where the fault lies.

There are two marked characteristics among those who hold to what is usually termed close or special communion, and these are: first, the doctrine of "*high churchism*," or *exclusive rights*; and, as a sequence of the high church idea, and to establish the claim to exclusive rights, the most of them claim apostolic succession in the ministerial office. But, as it is evident that there is not, at this day, under the sun, a denomination of Christians that can trace a regular line of succession from the apostles down to the present time, either in a regular line of bishops, or of immersed adult believers clear of infant baptism, I shall leave it for those holding such tenets to settle the question among themselves as to which party is, at this time, *bona fide*, entitled to the distinguishing appellation of "*The Church*." For, before I can be deeply enough interested in this question to give its claims a further investigation, I wish to be informed whether the Romanists,

Episcopalians, Baptists, Campbellites, or Mormons, are entitled by right to the cognomen.

In the investigation of the subject, it is important that we inquire into the time of the institution of the Lord's supper, that we may learn, if possible, in what relation it stands to the ordinance of water baptism; and whether or not baptism is a prerequisite to a participation of the communion. Upon this point really hangs the whole argument for strict communion. If baptism by water be a prerequisite for a participation of the Lord's supper, the fact can certainly be learned from some specific command, plain inference, or, in the order of their institution. If not thus found, the conclusion, it seems, would be entirely legitimate that the Saviour did not so design it. Then, let us proceed to investigate the time of the institution of these ordinances respectively.

According to our mode of reckoning time, Jesus was betrayed on Thursday night. He instituted the supper on the evening of the same day. He was crucified at the third hour, or about nine o'clock, on Friday forenoon (Mark xv. 25); he lay in the sepulcher until the morning of the third day after his crucifixion, or until Sunday morning (Mark xvi. 2-6). Then there was a lapse of two whole days and three nights between the time he broke the bread and gave it and the wine to his disciples, and the time of his resurrection from the dead. He then remained on earth forty days before his ascension. Acts i. 3: "To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days." Then, having led his disciples out as far as Bethany, and having given them the great commission to teach and baptize all nations, he ascended to heaven. Luke xxiv. 50, 51, and Matt. xxviii. 19. Here we find a space of forty-two days between the institution of the supper and the institution of Christian baptism; for this is the first command to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be found in the New Testament.

We have no record of the administration of Christian baptism under the commission until the day of Pentecost. The fact is, the apostles were commanded to wait until they were endued with power from on high to qualify them for their

responsible duties under the commission. Luke xxiv. 49: "But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." After the descent of the Holy Ghost, Peter preached to the multitude: many received the word gladly and were baptized. The sacrament was instituted at the passover just before our Lord's betrayal, and from the passover to Pentecost were fifty days; so that the supper in its administration preceded Christian baptism by at least fifty days. Then, from the foregoing facts, we are not warranted in the conclusion that the great Head of the Church designed that Christian or water baptism should be held as a prerequisite to the reception of the elements of his broken body and shed blood. If the order of institution forms an argument at all, it would be in favor of the supper's preceding water baptism. If baptism be a prerequisite to the reception of the bread and wine, it must be established by a precept given after the institution of these two ordinances. Such a precept I have been unable to find anywhere in the New Testament, given by the Saviour or any apostle; nay, more, I have been unable to find a passage from which I can, by any fair construction, infer such a conclusion.

Let us now inquire into the objects for which the Lord's supper was instituted. Mementoes have been common among all nations and in all ages; they are indelible records of facts, more certain and authentic in their nature than the records of history, from the consideration that no set of people could be induced to observe any institution or ceremony as commemorative of a fact, unless such event had actually taken place. Of such a nature was the Jewish passover, which was perpetuated in commemoration of the fact of the passing over of the first born of the Israelites by the destroying angel. Could the whole Jewish nation have been induced to observe the passover, for any considerable length of time, if no such event, as the slaying of the first born of the Egyptians, while the first born of the children of Israel were passed over, or spared, had occurred? We often hold in possession some object which we preserve with great care, as a memento of some loved one gone from earth forever. It is, perhaps, some object of little intrinsic value, but we esteem it as above price,

because when we look upon it, it brings to our mind the dear loved one.

Who hath not saved some trifling thing,
More prized than jewels rare?
A faded flow'r, a broken ring,
A tress of golden hair?

And that object reproduces in memory the form, features, actions, and words of the dear absent friends, and we love to dwell upon the many pleasant hours spent in their society; and in such reminiscences our hearts are often moved to their very depths. So Jesus, our Saviour, has given us this feast of bread and wine, which is symbolical and commemorative of his sufferings, as he said: "This do in remembrance of me." The sufferings and death of Jesus are more important to the world than any event on record in history. It is one that is worthy to be commemorated in all time and by all people.

We have just witnessed a grand centennial commemoration of the event of American Independence, and though not a man is living who witnessed any of those events, while the Declaration of Independence was read, while the orator spoke feelingly of scenes that transpired on that day one hundred years ago, amid the sound of martial music, and the booming of cannon, the hearts of gray-headed men and beardless youths, of aged matrons and blushing maidens, were stirred to their very depths in calling up the scenes and actions which led to American independence. The Redeemer came to give freedom to the world—to bring life and immortality to light; but to effect that glorious object, a condemned world must be freed from the curse of the violated law of God and the galling yoke of bondage to the prince of darkness. The redemption price was the blood of God's dear Son: yet, dear as it was, he met the demand and paid the price. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." When taken by the cruel Roman soldiery and nailed to the cross, he uttered no complaint, but in the awful moment when "he bare our sins in his own body," and the Father forsook him, he cried in an-

guish of soul, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Well does the poet exclaim,

O Lamb of God! was ever love—
Was ever pain like thine?

The bread and wine in the supper are designed to symbolize his broken, mangled body, and his blood which was shed for the remission of sins. And in the use of these impressive symbols, we commemorate his sufferings, or "show forth his death," and thus erect a standing monument of the fact that the Son of God was crucified for the sins of the world; and so, believers are reminded that Christ was put to death for their sins, and that all the blessings of their new or spiritual life, are obtained through him who died for them.

This commemorative institution of the death of the Saviour, is to be perpetuated to the end of the gospel dispensation. Our Lord, when he ordained this feast said: "This do in remembrance of me." Paul, in writing to the Corinthians—1 Cor. xi. 23, 24—said: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me." Paul declares that he received this sacrament from the Lord, or his authority to give it to the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ was of God, and it was to be received in remembrance of the Lord's passion; and in verse 26, he gives us unmistakable evidence of the design of its perpetuity till the second coming of the Saviour: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."

The inquiry very naturally arises, for whom was this supper instituted? or, who did our Lord intend should handle and partake of the emblems of his broken body and shed blood? These questions are of great importance, as they constitute, as we believe, an important point on which must turn the controversy for open or close communion.

In answering these questions, it may not be amiss to notice who were present when the Saviour administered it. We have no account that any but the twelve apostles were pres-

ent; in fact, the language of the inspired penman is conclusive that there were none others. Luke xxii. 14: "And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him." These twelve apostles constituted the Church in miniature, and it is, perhaps, as fair a specimen of the visible or militant Church as can be found in the Bible. I say visible Church, in contradistinction to the invisible or spiritual Church, which I shall have occasion to notice after awhile.

These twelve apostles were none of them perfect, as I suppose, for Peter soon after denied his Lord with an oath, and the Saviour had declared that Judas Iscariot was a devil. So the visible Church is composed of good and bad, some true Christians and others false, like Judas. Those twelve, then, being a fair representation of the Church on earth, we may infer legitimately that the Master designed that his ministers, officiating in his name and by his authority, should follow his example and offer the elements of this sacred ordinance to the Church. This is the first, or what may be called the external view of the subject.

To take a closer view of this important part of the subject, there is a character for whose real and spiritual benefit this supper was ordained; and though others may eat the bread and drink the wine used in this ordinance, they cannot by any possibility be benefited thereby. This ordinance is designed to remind the believer of what his Saviour did and suffered for him, and of the unbounded love of God manifested in the gift of his only Son to die that he, though guilty, "might not perish, but have everlasting life." The believer has in this sacramental feast a lively remembrance of the sufferings of his Saviour for him, which is well calculated to move the profoundest depths of his soul, and draw out his affections for his dearest Lord, and then is his faith strengthened and his hope brightened in prospect of heaven and a mansion at God's right hand, which the Saviour has gone to prepare for him. He is also strengthened for the conflicts of life, and can go forth in the discharge of his Christian duties and obligations feeling as did the apostle, "If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also

freely give us all things?" Then, it is the spiritual Church, or true believers alone, who are entitled to and can be partakers of the benefits of this ordinance.

Of what, then, is the spiritual Church or kingdom of Jesus Christ composed? As the apostle said of the Jews, "They are not all Israel that are of Israel;" so may we say of the Church: they are not all the Church that are of the Church. There are, doubtless, many whose names have been written upon the records of the Church, that are strangers to converting grace and communion with God.

Paul, in his epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 5, gives us a most beautiful outline of the Church. He says: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism." Here are the essential elements of the Church, and the requisites for any person's becoming a member of it. "One Lord," the only proper object of religious faith, the only name under heaven or among men given by which we must be saved. "One faith," that humble confidence in the one Lord Jesus Christ, that he is able and willing to save from sin, and then being justified by faith in the one Lord, the believer receives "the one baptism" that cleanses his soul from sin, produces a hatred thereto, and imparts to him a love for holiness, making him spiritually a "new creature," and giving peace with God through Jesus Christ. If any desire a Scriptural proof of this one essential baptism, he can be accommodated by referring to the following scriptures: 1 Cor. xii. 13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into *one body*;" Rom. vi. 3: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" That is, into the benefits of his death. All the material of which the spiritual church is composed, is prepared in the same way; all made alike in character and experience, and constituted but *one body* of such as rely upon Christ alone for salvation and grace, and have no confidence in the flesh. "Even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." And that hope springs up in the soul through the mercy of God in Christ, and the sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost in the heart.

All who have thus believed, and have received the true

spiritual baptism upon their hearts, have a right, by virtue of their relationship to the family of God, to partake of the Lord's supper, because they have faith "to discern the Lord's body," for such, and only such, can be benefited by a participation of the elements used in it.

There is another thought connected with this subject which I shall notice just at this place. The Saviour, in the most solemn manner, commanded his disciples to "do this in remembrance of him." So that it is the duty of every lover of the Lord to observe this ordinance "in memory of his dying friend." No Christian, then, can willingly neglect the observance of this ordinance, without dishonoring his Saviour, and bringing guilt upon his own soul, and thus wounding the Son of God in the house of his friends. How, then, can any child of God sit unconcerned, and witness the administration of this holy ordinance, and the command of his dying Lord ringing in his conscience, "This do in remembrance of me?" It is to be hoped that none that profess to love Jesus will ever thus dishonor him.

That it is obligatory upon the members of Christ's spiritual body to honor him in a participation of the supper, all will admit; but what is the rule by which a proper qualification to partake is to be determined? Who is to be the judge of such qualification? If we wish these questions settled beyond the possibility of caviling, we must appeal to the word of God for the answers. In answer to the first question, we refer to 1 Cor. xi. 29: "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Then, the condemnation of the unworthy participant ensues from "not discerning the Lord's body." To discern, is to gain a knowledge of, to separate. Hence, the unworthy participant does not gain a knowledge of the benefits of Christ's death to the comfort and consolation of his soul, or he fails to separate the spiritual and sacramental from the carnal use of the bread and wine in this ordinance. The bread and wine are designed to represent a spiritual fact, and that is, the spiritual benefits afforded to the soul of the believer through the sacrifice of Christ's blood; and in that sense his body becomes the spiritual meat

and his blood the spiritual drink of the believer, by which his inward life is sustained. Such is the lesson taught the disciples in John vi. 47, etc.: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. . . . Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life." Many of Jesus' disciples, because of their carnal nature, could not understand the spiritual application of this language, and went back and followed him no more. They gave his words a literal and not a spiritual meaning; hence, said they, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat? . . . this is an hard saying; who can hear it?" How, then, are the people of God to gain a knowledge of this grand spiritual mystery? I answer, by a living faith which unites the soul to Christ, and gives a new, a spiritual discernment. Paul taught his Corinthian brethren, 1 Cor. ii. 14: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." The worthy communicant must have faith that he may discern more than simple bread and wine in this ordinance; that they are the lively symbols of the broken body and shed blood of his dear Saviour, the benefits of which constitute the real spiritual meat and spiritual drink of his soul—the source and supply of his spiritual life. The rule, then, and the only rule given by inspiration is, has the individual faith in Christ as his all-sufficient and personal Saviour? We venture the assertion that all thus qualified, have an indefeasible right to partake of this feast.

Our next question is, Who is to be the judge of this qualification? Some may say, the church; others, that is the duty of the officers of the church, who have the oversight of the flock committed to their care; and, again, others may contend

that it is a question to be decided by the ministers of the gospel, who minister in holy things, and administer the ordinances of God's house. Now, we enter our dissent from these answers, in whole and in singular, for the following reasons:

1. That God has nowhere, in his word, either expressly or by fair implication, given to any man or set of men, or church, such authority to sit in judgment upon any one's case.

2. Had such authority been given to men, they could not, by any possibility, have discharged the high obligation. Religion is a personal thing, and ever must be such. Hence, no man or council of men, can decide the spiritual standing of another. They may, from his conduct or his good works, candidly believe him to be a converted man, but further than this they cannot go. They cannot be assured of the fact, because a hypocrite may put on a most beautiful exterior, and pass, to the eye of the world, and to the Church, for a most eminent saint. Then, as no man can judge the heart of his fellow-man beyond the possibility of mistake, he would, in the case of the communion, be subject to err in his judgment, and, therefore, be liable to admit some who were unworthy, and to debar others who were worthy; and if the decision rested upon him, and he were responsible for it, as he doubtless should be, in either case, he would be chargeable with great injustice in the house of his God. But a merciful Heavenly Father, who knows full well man's capabilities, knew he could not discharge such an obligation; hence he has graciously relieved him from its duties and responsibilities. Then, are we not warranted in the assertion that he who assumes such unwarrantable authority over the children of God, assumes a very fearful responsibility; yea, more, that he is a usurper in the house of God? The word of truth is plain as to who is to judge of a qualification for the communion, as well as upon whom the responsibility of communing is devolved. God has placed this responsible duty upon the only person upon earth that can determine it. Hence, we read in 1 Cor. xi. 28: "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." Here an inspired apostle has settled the question, as to whom the

judgment for a qualification to approach the Lord's table is referred; and this decision is in harmony with reason and common sense; also, in justice to all parties. Upon this divine decision of the question, the communicant is held responsible for his action in the premises, otherwise he could not be so held. He alone, of all earth's millions, knows or can know whether or not he is a disciple, a lover of Jesus. Hence, wrote Paul to his brethren again, 2 Cor. xiii. 5: "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves." This is where the whole matter of examination lies—with the individual and no where else.

If, then, water baptism is not a prerequisite to communion, and faith to discern the Lord's body be the only Scriptural qualification therefor; and if no man can by possibility judge of another's moral status, so as to determine certainly whether he believes in Christ to the saving of his soul; and if God has committed the decision of that matter to each individual Christian, and he only is responsible for his approach to the the Lord's table, where is there to be found the shadow of ground for close communion? Who has granted to any man or set of men the authority to say to God's dear children, "*Stand you there; approach not the table of thy Lord; we are more righteous than you*, because we have been dipped entirely under the water?" Such a course on the part of those claiming to be "*the Church*," or those claiming the exclusive right to be recognized as the ministers of Jesus Christ, is an open usurpation of power nowhere warranted by the teaching of the Scriptures, and can be justified only upon the ground of sectarian pride, bigotry, and superstition. Sectarian pride and bigotry that prompt to a self-assumed sanctity that is supposed to give a preference in the sight of God above all others; and superstition, that leads to the belief that they are responsible for the unworthiness of those who have not a right to the supper.

Suppose we inquire of the apostle James, who has the right to make laws to govern Christians in matters of conscience? The answer is in James iv. 12: "There is one law-giver, who is able to save, and to destroy; who art thou that judgest another?" Christians are servants, not of men, but of Jesus

Christ. Then, what did an inspired penman say respecting who should judge them? Rom. xiv. 4: "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth."

Baptism being a passive ordinance; that is, something done by one party for another, there is some propriety in the officers of the church instituting an inquiry into the qualification of the applicant; but the case is quite different in the communion, the latter being an active ordinance, something done by the individual for himself, and he only is responsible for the action.

In conclusion, I must say of close communion (I do not wish to be severe), that it cannot be viewed, when examined from a correct stand-point, in any other light than—

1. Schismatical, dividing the people of God upon one of the common rallying points of our holy Christianity, where *all* should show forth the Saviour's death.

2. It is anti-scriptural, having no command nor precept to support it in the Word of God, but is opposed to Christ's intercessory prayer, John xvii. 23: "Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. . . . I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." Now, this prayer was not that all should be Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, or of any other denominational name, but that there should be unity among the body of believers; that God's children should be one.

3. It is dogmatical and arrogant; an assumption of the right of a thing without sufficient proof; consequently, it leads to a spirit of *phariseism*. Do we not see a manifestation of this spirit in the actions of those ministers who practice close communion? Why, all over the length and breadth of this country, in many places, they will not invite ministers of other denominations to fill their pulpits, nor to sit in the stand while they occupy them; men, too, whose piety and learning are undisputed, and whom out of the pulpit they can but call *brother*. Strange that such will not allow the

authority of any minister except those of their own Church and creed, and yet acknowledge the work of others to be good work, and true work, work worthy to be received whenever it knocks at the door of their Church for admission.

4. It hinders the progress of religion and the conversion of souls. The world says: "If Christians cannot meet at the table of their Father, and testify together to the fact that Jesus died to save sinners, when they all profess to be saved by the same Lord, and through the same faith, there must be something wrong in the whole system." Indeed, many of the youth of the country imbibe so much of the sectarian spirit, that they are persuaded that they cannot obtain religion unless at a meeting of people of their own peculiar views on doctrine and practice. And why so? Because they have been taught from infancy that none but a certain class of ministers has a right to preach the gospel and minister at God's altar.

5. It is tyrannical, because there are many good and pious men and women in close communion Churches, who do not approve of such communion, and who believe that the practice is not supported by the word of God, and would like to unite with Christians of other denominations in remembering their crucified Lord; but their conscience is trammelled by the law of a tyrannical Church, that threatens them with the ban of expulsion, the severest penalty known to the Church; such as would be inflicted for adultery, arson, or murder, should they ever exercise the liberty of conscience and sit at the Master's table with another denomination. They wish to obey their dying Lord, "This do in remembrance of me," but dare not, lest they should be arraigned as guilty of a great crime, one of sufficient magnitude to deserve expulsion from a place among the family of God.

"But," say these self-exalted ones, "all can join our Church, or, *the Church*, and then all can commune together." This is very bold presumption, indeed, that all others must bend their consciences to fit the doctrinal jacket which they have cut and sewed to their own peculiar measure, in order to have union. Because good men of other Churches refuse to make such sacrifices of conscience, they are in almost every

sermon, and on almost every Sabbath, cried down as heretics, and simply because they follow not with them. Would such not do well to heed the following scripture? "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us; and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, forbid him not: for he that is not against us is on our part. For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea." Mark ix. 38-42.

I would ask the advocates of close communion, if they desire that other denominations should make it a business in their pulpit administrations to turn aside from the pure gospel and villify them, and by round assertions void of proof, make the impression that they are heretics, and have no right to the privileges of saints? I imagine the answer would be a loud "No!" Then let the Son of God whisper into their ears: "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." If they would be thus guided by Divine counsel in their actions to others, and learn to cultivate a spirit of liberality among their members, and "neither as being lords over God's heritage," it would be well for themselves and also for the world.

I pray God that the time may soon come when our close communion brethren shall learn to "put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness," and forbear to abuse those whom they say they believe to be Christians and expect to meet in heaven, but who differ from them on the principles and practices of a common faith.

ART. VII.—Names and Doctrine of God.

I.—'EL.

THIS is the oldest name of the Divine Being of which we have any knowledge. It is derived from the verb '*Ul*, to be strong; and, hence, among the Semitic nations—i. e., the Hebrews, Arameans, Arabians, Phœnicians, Canaanites, and Ethiopians—'*El*, the *Mighty One*, is the name designating the Semitic conception of the highest deity, the gods; the polytheistic notion being the primitive one, and *power* the dominant idea. It is applied for this purpose in no otherwise than in respect to *strength*, *dominion*, *power*. It was not an abstract notion of immortality, nor existence, nor the highest love of justice, which was apotheosized, but *power*, and the *authority* which power implies. It need not be inquired here whence the notion came. It is sufficient to say that the Semitic nations considered it the type of a being beyond themselves, and accordingly they named it *El*, and worshiped it. Qualified by various other words, it was used in the pre-Mosaic period to designate also the Hebrew conception of God. Confining ourselves in the selection of such qualifying words, to the ground-form of the Pentateuch, wherein must be found, if at all, the theology of the patriarchs, as contradistinguished from the later theology of Moses, we may make out the early Hebrew doctrine of God. Thus, in Genesis xlviii. 3, Jacob said unto Joseph, *Almighty El* appeared unto me, etc.; from *Shad*, to be mighty; hence, literally, the *mighty Mighty*, intensive Jehovah, appeared unto Abraham and said: "I am *Almighty El*." He was known to Moses as *Jehovah*, but not to Abraham; as in Exodus vi. 3: "I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as *Almighty El*; as Jehovah I was not known unto them." According to a count of the references given in Taylor's Hebrew Concordance, *El Shadi* occurs in Genesis fifteen times, and, according to Furst, in the pre-Mosaic book of Job, thirty-one times. 2. *Olaum*, Gen. xxi. 33: "And Abraham called upon the name of Jehovah," viz.: *El Olaum*, the Everlasting *El*. The Hebrew knew him, therefore, as the almighty and everlasting God (*El*), though not yet as the

only one. He is rather a tutelary El. 3. Raui, Gen. xvi. 13: "And she called the name of Jehovah, the *Seeing El*," from which comes the attribute of ubiquity. To Isaac he appeared as the El of Abraham; to Jacob, as the El of Abraham and Isaac, thereby contradistinguishing himself from the God of the Canaanites, Phœnicians, Arameans, and other nations among which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob lived. The name was afterwards nationalized as El Israel, the El ruling over, and recognized by the descendants of Jacob. So, therefore, the *identity* of the *idea* is preserved and transmitted, and God—so nearly the *true* God, only as is represented by these attributes—is known to all the pre-Mosaic Hebrews as the Almighty, All-seeing, and *everlasting* El, though, still, not yet as the 'only one. They are still polytheists, and El is still tutelary. Thus far he has to them no moral qualities, and if the Hebrew have any conception of him in his *moral* aspect, it must be only such a conception as the Hebrew mind could form from the exhibitions of his almightiness, and the evidences of his ubiquity and eternity. As yet, El-oha and El-oheim are not used, these being *after forms* to denote the concentration in El of a plurality of perfections. He does not become El kana, the *jealous* El, the El zealous in the defense of his own honor, until, Exodus xx. 5, he so announces himself to Moses, and asserts it again and again in the peculiarity, and often-times the severity, of his dealings with Israel. He does not become the tender, the compassionate, the merciful God, the *El rahum*, until he so reveals himself during the same dispensation. In Deut. xxxii. 4, he is the *El emunah*, the *unchangeable* El. In Numbers i. 14, he is *El deyoth*, the *knowing* El, and, by implication, the living El, as asserted in Joshua iii. 10. Hence, the notion or doctrine of God as deducible from the name El and its adjuncts, is, the *almighty*, *all-seeing*, *everlasting*, *jealous*, *merciful*, *unchangeable*, *wise*, and *living* El, and, therefore, still further distinguished from the El of other nations.

By the *post-Mosaic* writers, El is used interchangeably with Baal, as by the authors of the books of Samuel and Chronicles. Baal is the *Mighty One*, the *Lord*, the *Possessor*, and *Ruler* over things in so far as he possesses them—the *nomen numinis*

of a great part of the Semitic races. Also, with *Ab*, *Father*, *Begetter*, *Creator*, as in Jeremiah ii. 27, 28, the stock and stone being called *Abi* in the one, and *Elohei*—an after form of *El*—in the other verse. With *Ath*, it is the God of eternity, the *pater Chronou* (πατερ χρονου) of the early or Orphic Greek. It is also used interchangeably with *Yaho*, a characteristic name of *El* at a very early period. In the Chaldean religion, it is the mystic and unmentionable name of the mysterious deity enthroned above the seven heavens, representing the spiritual *light-principle*, and also conceived of as *демиург* or *world-creator*. Modified forms of this and cognate oriental conceptions were, at a much later day, grafted into the Neo-Platonism of Alexandria, and thence into Christianity, developing, in the first and second centuries, into such heresies as those of Cerinthus, Marcion, Valentinus, and others. The Chaldean *Yaho* is the Phœnician *Helios*, *Father of Light*, used interchangeably with *Baal*, and *Baal* with *Ab*; and both *Baal* and *Ab* are used interchangeably with *El*. *El*, according to Taylor (Heb. Con. Art. 'Ut), finds its Latin synonym in *deus*, while *deus*, according to the learned Pococke (Newton's Principia Gen. Scho.), is derived from the Arabic *du*, *Lord*, one who possesses power and exercises it. *Numen*, I should think, is more nearly its synonym. However, the signification of these names being determined, that of *El*, also, becomes known. Hence, we have for the early Hebrew conception of God, as far as deducible from the *El* of the nations, its adjuncts and synonyms, thus: The *almighty*, *all-seeing*, everlasting, jealous, merciful, unchangeable, wise, and living Creator and Lord. *Baal*, however, though used interchangeably with *El*, is scarcely to be regarded as synonymous with it, except in *intension*. *Baal* is always *El individualized*, and more or less anthropomorphic, while *El* is *Baal* at one time or place, *yaho*, *El-Israel*, etc., at another, not representing in the mind of the nations any idea of distinct personality at all. *Theos*, in the Greek, was not always *Zeus* or *pater chronou*, though *Zeus* and *pater chronou* were always *Theos*. So, also, *Neptune*, the *numen æquoris*, is always *Deus*, though *Deus* is sometimes *Bacchus* or *Jupiter*, as well as *Neptune*. There was nothing in *Theos* to

limit the Greek mind to monotheism. The Greek offered neither praise, nor prayer, nor sacrifices to Theos, as *Theos*, but to Theos as Zeus or Pallas, etc. Nor was there any thing in the notion *Deus* thus to confine the Roman mind, nor in the Teuisco of our Saxon ancestors. So far as the influence of the conception expressed by the one word *El*, of the Semitic dialects, is concerned, neither was there any thing in it to determine the Hebrew mind to monotheism. Hence, the method alluded to of preserving the *identity* of the idea involved in *El*. *El* said unto Jacob that he was the *same* *El* who appeared unto Abraham and Isaac. It was necessary that he should have said this, for Jacob is not yet assured of his all-comprehending unity. Joseph was high in authority and distinguished by piety, but he makes no missionary effort in behalf of the Egyptians. We have no reason to believe that Joseph was assured of the *oneness* of God. He worshiped the true God only as he recognized him, just as man does now. The *El* of Joseph, as Joseph conceived of him, was a tutelary *El*, whom *he* preferred above the *El* of his neighbors; and in the theistic controversy which afterwards arose between the Hebrews and the Egyptians, *supremacy* is the only item involved; and the supremacy so marvelously asserted and sustained in the contest by the Hebrew *El*, is only one step in the process whereby the Hebrew doctrine of God, is to become a more and more improved doctrine. Notice: *El* was identified on his second appearance to Abraham, by himself referring to the circumstances and quoting the language of his first visit. So, also, in the third and subsequent revelations which he makes to Abraham. In a similar manner he is identified by Jacob, and, further, by declaring himself "the God of thy fathers," the God of Abraham and of Isaac; in Egypt, as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, while now he may be identified, *additionally*, as the *El*, or God, "who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." If the idolatry of Aaron and the Israelites were not intended as an indirect worship of the same *El*, it was the indirect worship of one whose existence they had not been called upon to doubt, and whose worship they had not been called upon to disown. The process of elucidating the true character of God—not

the character of the true God—must be carried forward. He implants the idea of his spirituality by prohibiting image-worship, and the new idea of his jealousy, by visiting upon them severe inflictions when any other El was worshiped. That an El is, they never doubted, but that El is *one*, and such as had been described, must be declared to them again and again. It was never a contest between theism and atheism, but between polytheism and monotheism. Even at a later day in Hebrew history, Ahab did not deny that the El of Elijah was God. His sin was in asserting that Baal was God, also, and in practically asserting his superiority. Similarly among the Greeks and Romans; indeed, of every ancient nation of whose theology we have any knowledge at all. The Greek mind had no use for Theos without the 'o (ho, *definite art.*), either expressed or understood. It was not, Theos did thus and so, or will do thus and so, but invariably 'o (ho,) Theos, some particular one of the gods. Theos was merely the divinity in Zeus, Neptune, Pluto, etc., and the divinity in each was a divinity distinct from that of all the others. The Theos in Zeus was merely a Greek conception of something above themselves, localized and labeled Zeus. So, through the whole of the Greek polytheism. Among the Romans, it was the same. Ovid could preserve intact his orthodoxy on the subject of Deus, and yet make the deus of Jupiter dethrone the deus of Saturn, and the deus of Mars wage war, and the deus baptized as Bacchus, get drunk. Among the Hebrews, theistic discussions in those days were as the discussions of creeds in these days, intrinsically of much more importance, perhaps, but illustrated by them nevertheless. It was no more difficult on the score of conscience for the oriental—or the occidental, either, as to that—to substitute the worship of one *El* for that of another, than it is for a modern churchman to change his creed. It is a matter of judgment, birth, education, taste, or prejudice, and not conscience. A name is useful, of course, only in so far as it embodies a conception, thereby rendering it tangible, and enabling you to lay it away out of your mind, and take it up again by name when you have use for it. It is right for me to worship God, though *as to whether it is right or not*

depends upon what sort of ideas I attach to the word, for I can worship him only as I know him or conceive him to be. He is an animated essence, a being in whom cluster, perhaps, ten thousand attributes, whereas, I can be acquainted with only some half-dozen. If I should ascribe the wrong attributes, or a greater or less number of attributes, to him than he possesses, I would not be worshipping him as he is. God is to every man what every man conceives him to be, and so does every man worship him. The advantage of a name is to *unify* and *identify* our ideas of him. Notwithstanding this, not even do all Christian Englishmen—who employ the same name—worship the same God, though they worship, perhaps, the same essence, inasmuch as they ascribe the same long series of acts to him, but not the same character. I ascribe to him too much of the merciful; you, not enough. I ascribe to him too little or too much of justice; while, according to your conception of him, he does every thing according to his pleasure, or the *whims* of the moment, whether it be just or unjust. One man conceives him as one living far back in the beginning of eternity, having wisdom and power enough to say that such and such things shall come to pass *to-day*. Another conceives him as sitting wrapped in the whiteness of the ages, far up in the evening of eternity, with historical knowledge enough to know that such and such things *did* come to pass *to-day*. Another conceives him as a *perpetual now*, living in the early morning, and noon, and evening of eternity at the same moment, with wisdom and knowledge enough to know all that *is* transpiring, whether within the limit of *our* months and years or out of it. [Predestination and like terms are used in reference to God only *per similitudinem*. He is conditioned by neither time nor space, and, therefore, he merely *knows*, neither *fore-knowing* nor *after-knowing*. All knowledge is with him a *present* knowledge; all *destination* is a *present* destination. To insist so strenuously upon the predestination item of the doctrine of God, is to reason upon him who is unconditioned as if he were conditioned. But this, by the way.] It matters not by what name we call him, whether God, or El, or Yho, or Theos, provided only our notion of him be correct. The more incor-

rect my notion of God is, the more nearly does my worship become the worship of Jupiter, or Zeus, or Fate, etc. Every creed has in it more or less of a doctrine of God. Every man has his creed, and the creed of each man, whether he be a churchman or not, differs more or less from the creed of every other man. So it is with nations and ages. The doctrine of God was more clearly and strongly elucidated in the days of Elijah, the prophet, than it was in the days of Jacob and Joseph, though polytheistic notions were still prevalent. The error or sin which Ahab committed was, not in denying the existence of the El of the prophet, but in denying to him his proper attributes in so far as he supposed that Baal was God also. Theism, and not atheism, is indigenous to the human mind, before the fall and since the fall. Man does not have to be reasoned into the belief of theism; he reaches it *per saltum*, and in spite of himself. He must go into his closet in order to reason himself *out* of theism, if he can. But nations have no closets, and, hence, nations never even pretend to be atheistic. It will be a new and blessed era in theological science, when the theologian ceases to damage his cause in the eye of all the world, by attempting to prove that which is axiomatic. I say *El* is, because I cannot help it, and so it is with every man. Argumentation and philosophy there must be, of course, but let it be in order to a definite understanding and agreement as to the character of God, and not as to his existence, otherwise I may christen my conception of him Fate, and you may christen yours El, or deitas, or the Anglo-Saxon God, all agreeing, perhaps, in no other respect than that of existence. The object of God in the tuition of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the race of Israel, was, not to reveal his existence, for they could not deny that, but to make himself more distinctive, and to inculcate an improved knowledge of his character, as will appear from a brief consideration of his Mosaic name, to wit:

II.—JEHOVAH,

The introduction of which is the beginning of a new era in Hebrew theology. God appears in the flaming bush to Moses, and "calls himself the El of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and 'the El of thy fathers,'" thereby enabling Moses to identify

him; to distinguish him from the El as conceived of and worshiped by other nations. Had he merely spoken, without introducing himself, nothing could have hindered Moses from believing that, if an El at all, he might be the El of Midia, rather than the El of his fathers; for we have no reason to suppose that Moses, at this period of his life, was not a polytheist. He, also, gives himself the name *Jehovah*, which must be linked in the Hebrew mind to the old conception of the national El, by Moses' calling him *Jehovah*, "the El of thy fathers," otherwise the Hebrews might naturally regard him as some new and unfriendly god, of whom Moses might have learned during his long absence from them. The word *ehyeh*, from which *Yhova*, had, of course, all the while had a place in the Hebrew vocabulary, but to this new use it had never before been appropriated. The old conception being identified with the new name, *Jehovah* becomes henceforth a memorial to all generations, a perpetual reminder of his identity, the Existing, Abiding, Permanent One, distinguished from whomsoever else might be called El, and to attribute change to whom is to deny his being. So the Hebrews' God becomes the one changeless, continuing God, and *Jehovah* is his distinguishing name, and into the knowledge of whose *oneness* and true character the Hebrews must be indoctrinated, not in the midst of the corruptions of the Egyptians, nor in the midst of the polytheism of Canaan, but in the long, hard school of the wilderness, under the immediate tuition of *Jehovah*, who instils and establishes conceptions of himself as the only God, the Mighty, the Enduring, the Invisible, the Just, the Merciful, the Jealous, the Wise, and Holy God, the God "who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," and the "God of thy fathers," and of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the Just Judge of the whole earth. The Hebrew mind must, of necessity, have undergone two difficult processes, which could not have been wrought upon it elsewhere than in the isolation of the wilderness. It must be relieved of its polytheistic notions, and correct conceptions of the true character of the one universal God introduced. Hence, the new, distinctive name *Jehovah*, and the complex, rigid, and peculiar institutions of Moses.

ART. VIII.—*The Baptism of the Holy Ghost.*

THE doctrine of spiritual baptism being of vast importance, and since there has been comparatively little written or published on the subject, I propose giving it a brief examination in the following order, to wit:

I.—THE REALITY OF SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

John the Baptist says (Matt. iii. 11): "I indeed baptize you with water: . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and *with* fire." Here "John draws the contrast between his own baptism and that of Christ, which exists in three particulars—the subject, the agent, and the means. In the case of John, the subject was the body, the agent was a man, and the means was the water. In the case of Christ, the subject was the mind, the agent was the Holy Spirit, and the means were the truth and emotions of God." This prediction of John was fully verified on the day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius, both in the Spirit's purifying and miraculous influences.

Paul says (1 Cor. xii. 13): "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit." Here the Holy Spirit is directly said to baptize, and in this case all external acts are, of course, excluded, and to purify is the only appropriate sense of the words. If any shall say that admitting to the Church by the external rite, or that extraordinary gifts are here meant, I reply: admission into the visible Church is never given by the Spirit, but by man. And this baptism is as much an internal work of the Holy Spirit, as the causing to drink into one Spirit, which is not external, but an internal and real work of the Spirit. [See Dr. E. Beecher on Baptism, pp. 26, 28.] Nor could extraordinary gifts be here meant, for the text says: We all—including the apostles and all other believers—have been made to share in this baptism into one body, and to drink into one Spirit, which will not apply to extraordinary gifts, for

they were not conferred upon all indiscriminately. Besides, both this text and the parallel one (Gal. iii. 27, 28), expressly point out the legitimate effects of this internal work of the Spirit, here called baptism, in removing all the distinctions known among men; effects which cannot, with any degree of propriety, be affirmed either of the external rite or of extraordinary gifts. "For," says the apostle, "as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." These effects, the removal of all these natural distinctions, clearly involve the idea of an internal spiritual work, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh—the old man with his deeds—and that of *putting on Christ*, or "the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." [Compare Rom. xiii; 14, and Col. iii. 9–11.]

Dr. Beecher says upon this subject (p. 111): "What, then, are the facts as they present themselves in the New Testament? They are these:

1. There is a baptism infinitely more important than the external baptism, and of which the external baptism is but a sign.

2. In the spiritual baptism, a believer is actually purged from sin and guilt by the Holy Ghost. In the external, the forgiveness of sins is openly announced to him, on the assumption that he has repented and believes, as he professes.

3. The person baptized (with water) is regarded as calling on the name of the Lord for forgiveness, and the baptizer as announcing his forgiveness in the name of the Lord. Acts xxii. 16.

4. In the case of internal baptism, there is no such external use of the name of God, but a real forgiveness, resulting in actual union to Christ. Hence,

5. The form, *baptizesthai eis onoma Christou*—to be baptized in the name of Christ—is adapted to express the external baptism; *baptizesthai eis Christou*—to be baptized into Christ—to express the internal baptism that actually unites to Christ.

6. To this view all facts accord, for in every instance where

onoma (name) is used, there is internal evidence in the passage to prove that external baptism is meant; Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts ii. 38; Acts viii. 16; Acts x. 48; Acts xix. 5; Acts xxii. 16; 1 Cor. i. 13, 15.

But in every case where *onoma* (name) is omitted, and *eis* (into) precedes *Christon* (Christ) or *soma* (body), denoting the spiritual body of Christ (the Church invisible), there is internal evidence that external baptism is not meant, and that internal is meant. Rom. vi. 3, 4; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27."

There are several passages in the Old Testament scripture which, when properly understood, are evidently prophecies of spiritual baptism, particularly Isa. iv. 4; Mal. iii. 1-3; and Ezek. xxxvi. 25.

That these passages are predictions of the baptism of the Holy Ghost in the days of the Messiah, the testimony of the fathers is very abundant. And though their theological views are not to be depended upon in every instance, still, in this particular, they are of some value in ascertaining what the sense of the Church was upon this subject at that early period, even down to the age when miracles had scarcely ceased.

II.—THE NATURE OF SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

I now come directly to the examination of spiritual baptism, as it is enjoyed by the Church in the present day. The reader has, no doubt, ere this, anticipated my view, at least in part, as it has incidentally appeared in the course of this investigation. It corresponds in general with conversion or regeneration. It is, in fact, regeneration itself, exclusive of the different states of mind which precede that change. It includes the ideas of the forgiveness or remission of sins, the purification of the heart or the moral powers of the soul, and union with Christ, or a translation from the kingdom of Satan to that of God's dear Son. Or, in other words, it is a death to sin, and a resurrection to a new life; and, also, a progressive sanctification—the mortification of the flesh by a continual death, and a continual resurrection to a life of holiness. But since the adherents of the opposite view deny these positions, and others aver that the Church does not now enjoy the blessings of spiritual baptism in any shape, it

becomes indispensable that I should present some arguments in support of this view. From the amount of evidence to support the conclusion before stated, it is clear that the purification effected by the Holy Spirit as a voluntary agent is of two kinds: 1. A deliverance from the guilt of sin; i. e., liability to be punished, and from a sense of guilt through the atonement. 2. A purification from spiritual defilement. It is through the atonement that pardon is given, and through the Holy Spirit conviction of sin is produced; and by him, also, a sense of guilt is taken away in view of the atonement; and in this sense he is said to cleanse from sin by the blood of Christ. This kind of purification may be called legal, as it relates to guilt, forgiveness, and atonement. The other kind of purification may be called moral, inasmuch as it removes the unholy and impure feelings and habits of the mind, and produces in their place those that are pure. This is the sacrificial sense of baptism. This division corresponds, also, with the twofold object of the atonement: (1) to remove legal obstructions or cancel the claims of the law against the sinner, and (2) to provide a fountain of cleansing or purification for the removal of moral pollution. Hence, the relation, as before observed, existing between water baptism and the atonement of Christ. He has suffered and atoned for us, and we are baptized, calling on the name of the Lord, and our forgiveness is announced accordingly. The blood of Christ, applied by the Spirit of God, purges the polluted conscience from dead works, to serve the living God. This is the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Ghost. This baptism or purification of the Spirit, also includes the idea of a mystical union with Christ, indicated by a number of Scripture passages as effected by baptism into Christ, or into the body of Christ. It is a change of state or condition in a moral point of view; a translation from one state to another, as from a state of sin and condemnation to a state of peace and pardon, or from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God. It involves the ideas of deliverance from sin, security against sin, and assurance of ultimate and complete happiness. This vital change is well

illustrated by the baptism of the Israelites unto (or into) Moses at the passage of the Red sea. (1 Cor. x. 21.) This text is in perfect keeping with all those passages indicating spiritual baptism, inasmuch as the same mode of speech is employed—*eis ton Mosen*—into Moses. "Baptism here," says Dr. Beecher, "denotes neither Christian baptism nor external baptism, but a throwing back of the name of the anti-type upon the type, from a regard to similar effects. Believers, by spiritual baptism, are delivered from Satan and united to Christ. The children of Israel were delivered from Pharaoh, and really united to Moses, as a leader and a saviour, by the cloud and the sea. There was here no *external profession*, but a *real union to Moses* as a leader, effected by a separation and deliverance from Pharaoh. In all this, Moses was a type of Christ, and, therefore, the name of the anti-type as thrown back upon this transaction, and it is called a baptism into Moses, but not into the name of Moses. On the same principle; i. e., regard to effects, spiritual baptism is called the anti-type of the salvation of Noah and his family in the Ark. For as the one actually saved Noah in the Ark, so the other actually saves believers in Christ." That the change here brought to view is a real, internal, sensible change wrought by the Spirit of God, is abundantly evident from the varied and pointed language of the sacred writers upon this subject, all clearly expressive of putting off the former character, and putting on and appearing in a new character, suited to the moral government of God and the moral condition of man. It is called the "putting off the old man with his deeds;" "the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts," and "putting on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness;" "the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." It is also called "the putting on of Christ," with all the blessed consequences. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." [Compare Eph. iv. 22-24; Col. iii. 9-12; Gal. iii. 27, 28; and 1 Cor. xii. 13.]

III.—THE AUTHOR OR AGENT EMPLOYED IN SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

As we have already seen, there are a number of Old Testament prophecies in which it is clearly predicted that the Messiah should purify or baptize. And as Dr. Beecher remarks (p. 25): "This view alone fully explains the existing expectation, prevalent among the Jews, that the Messiah would baptize. [John i. 25.] But especially is this foretold in that last and prominent prophecy of Malachi (iii. 1-3), which was designed to fill the eye and the mind of the nation until he came."

He is here presented to the mind in all his majesty and power; but amid all other ideas, that of purifying is most prominent. He was, above all things, to purify and purge, and that with power so great, that few could endure the fiery day. "Who may abide the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth?"

And, as we have already seen, the New Testament is equally clear and explicit upon this subject. In that oft-repeated text (Matt. iii. 11), it was clearly predicted by John that the Messiah should baptize. Says he: "I indeed baptize you with water; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." And in 1 Cor. xii. 13, the apostle ascribes this baptism directly to the agency of the Holy Spirit himself. He says: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." The testimony of the fathers upon this subject is, also, full and explicit. From the foregoing, the Scriptures clearly refer the baptism of the Holy Spirit to Christ as the author of that work, and also as clearly refer this work to the direct agency of the Holy Spirit as an intelligent, voluntary, divine agent. Hence, while one prominent text says, in reference to Christ, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," another, with equal clearness, affirms that it is "By one Spirit we all are baptized into one body," making the Holy Ghost the immediate agent in this internal baptism. And there is no real contradiction in the Word of God.

In the great scheme of salvation, all the persons of the blessed Trinity, constituting the one God, are essentially engaged, but it has pleased the Father that Christ should have the pre-eminence in all things pertaining to the Church.

Hence, he says: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." And, again: "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will;" and, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." But all things of a spiritual nature are under the direction of Christ, as the Head of the Church, the spiritual body. He has suffered and atoned for us, and, hence, he is the procurer of every spiritual good, and it is to him we address our prayers at the door of mercy. Hence, there is a propriety that he should be the dispenser of all blessings. And although the Spirit is the prime agent in the work of conversion, still, Christ concurs in it in every instance; and we are baptized in his name, and it is in his name that our forgiveness is announced. Hence, the propriety, too, of his being represented in the gospel as the author of spiritual baptism, especially at the beginning of the Christian dispensation. For a very prominent object of this baptism, in its extraordinary influence, was the stupendous miracles wrought in attestation of Christ's mission and authority to change the dispensation; and its objects accomplished, this extraordinary baptism ceased with the age of miracles. But inasmuch as the Holy Ghost is a voluntary agent, and since the gospel is the ministration of the Spirit; and inasmuch as the prominent object of his presence in the Church is to supply the personal absence of Christ, and especially since he is the principal agent in conversion,—which is, in fact, the baptism of the Holy Ghost—there is, therefore, the greatest propriety in his exercising the prerogative through all future time. Consequently, for this purpose, the Spirit is promised and sent by the Father; and he proceeds from the Father and the Son, and he is emphatically styled "The Promise of the Father." I, therefore, arrive at this conclusion upon the subject: That both Christ and the Spirit exercise an agency in the administration of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that there is a propriety in assigning this work of the Spirit, in his extraordinary gifts and miraculous powers, to Christ as the immediate agent. And since this baptism is continued in the Church in its ordinary effects, in purifying the heart of the believer, by the washing of regeneration, and uniting the soul to Christ, by translating

it from the power of darkness to the kingdom of God's dear Son, there appears to be the greatest propriety in assigning this work more immediately to the province of the Holy Spirit. And it is in accordance with this view, that I shall endeavor to prosecute the subject in this investigation.

IV.—THE MEANS EMPLOYED IN SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

In noticing the *means* employed in the baptism of the Spirit, I shall not attempt an enumeration of all the means and instrumentalities which are employed in the work of conversion, but only such as strictly belong to spiritual baptism. And these are three—the truth of God, the blood of Christ, and the direct agency of the Holy Spirit.

1. *The Truth, or Word of God.* That the word of God exerts a salutary influence in spiritual baptism, is absolutely evident from a number of scripture passages. Believers are said to be *begotten* with the word of Truth, to be *born* of the word, to be *made free* by the truth, and to be *cleansed* and *sanctified* through the truth. And Paul commended the Ephesian elders to God and the word of his grace, and added: "It is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them who are sanctified." Consequently, the *truth* or *word* of God holds a pre-eminent place among the means employed in dispensing the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Again: the apostle speaking of Christ's purifying the Church (Eph. v. 26) says: "That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water, *by the word.*" This passage brings to view a purification symbolized by the washing of water, but it is expressly said to be effected *by the word*, as the instrument.

Christ said to the disciples (John xv. 3): "Now ye are clean *through the word* which I have spoken unto you." And God has, in other instances, used water as the symbol of truth. "Then will I *sprinkle clean water* upon you, and ye shall be *clean.*" It is evident that this celebrated prophecy of Ezekiel alludes primarily to a great purification to be effected by the truth under the similitude of water, and not a literal sprinkling of water in the ordinance of baptism. Hence the propriety of the expressions, the "*washing* of regeneration" and "*renewing* of the Holy Ghost," to denote the

beginning and progress of the divine life by the Spirit under the symbol of water.

In all the instances of conversion recorded in the New Testament, the truth holds a prominent place. Paul reminded Timothy that from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures, which were able to make him wise unto salvation. The Ethiopian treasurer read the word of God, and it was explained to him by Philip. Lydia heard the word, and attended unto the things which were spoken by Paul. And so of all the other recorded instances. And the same fact is corroborated by the whole history of revivals of religion in every age and country, and, also, by our own experience in the present day. We witness no conversions away from the knowledge of the truth. We hear of no revivals springing up in destitute settlements, where the gospel is not preached. "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?"

2. *The Blood of Christ.* The blood of Jesus Christ is also a means of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It is the meritorious or efficacious cause of the sinner's return to God, for it lies at the very foundation of his justification and sanctification in a governmental point of view. We are represented as purchased or redeemed with his blood, as washed from our sins in his blood, and as sanctified or cleansed by his blood. And it is a solemn truth that all that is valuable to the sinner, both in a legal and moral point of view, is to be ascribed to the efficacy of Christ's blood. The blood of Christ derives its value from the fact that he has become our sacrifice for sin, a substitute to the law and justice of God, a sin-offering for us, and by his stripes, or sufferings, we are healed. The atonement, as has been remarked, was prefigured and illustrated by the Levitical purifications, and its abiding efficacy was typically set forth by "the waters of separation" (Num. xix.), which constituted a perpetual fountain of cleansing for the ceremonially unclean. And, as we have seen before, the baptism of the Spirit is twofold—deliverance from sin and purification from spiritual defilement, correspondent with the double object of atonement.

The blood of Christ is rendered available by its being applied—or sprinkled—to the polluted conscience. In the case

of the paschal lamb, it was not only necessary that the lamb should be slain, and its blood shed, but to render that blood available, it was indispensable that it should also be *sprinkled*; and it was this sprinkled blood that preserved the first-born of Israel when the destroying angel passed through the land. Christ has become our passover—"the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." But his blood must not only be shed, but also sprinkled, in every instance, to render it available for lost sinners. Hence, it is significantly called "*the blood of sprinkling*." It is deposited in heaven, a *fountain opened*, like that which the prophet saw, for the *washing away* of sin and uncleanness. It is also called "*the precious blood of Christ*," and "*the blood of God*," in reference to its intrinsic value. But, as we have already seen, this inestimable ingredient, in a legal as well as a moral point of view, must be applied to us individually by the agency of the Spirit, to become available.

3. *The Agency of the Holy Spirit.* The direct agency of the Spirit is, of course, indispensable as a *means* in the administration of spiritual baptism. But this subject has been already so fully illustrated, as to render a distinct head at this point unnecessary. I will simply refer the reader to what has gone before, and proceed.

V.—THE EFFECTS OF SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

The legitimate *effects* of the baptism of the Spirit are threefold. They involve the ideas of a spiritual or moral death and burial; a quickening and resurrection to a new life, and a continued death to sin, or mortification of the appetites, answerable to the Scripture doctrine of a progressive sanctification or growth in grace.

1. This baptism produces a *death to sin*. The apostle says, (Rom. vii. 9): "I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." "For I, through the law, am dead to the law, that I might live unto God" (Gal. ii. 19). "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ" (Rom. vii. 4). All mankind in a state of nature, are represented as dead in trespasses and sins, but here is a different death brought to

view; a spiritual or moral death; a death, not in sin, but to sin. The sinner is *alive* to sin, but dead to God and holiness; but the believer is *alive* to God and *dead* to sin. This moral death is produced or effected by spiritual baptism. Says the apostle, Rom. vi. 3, 4: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, *were baptized into his death?* Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death," and (Col. ii. 12) "buried with him in baptism."

This moral death includes the idea of a crucifixion, a death to sin, and a burial with Christ. These changes which occurred with Christ naturally and externally, are analogous to what takes place with the believer spiritually and internally, and thus supply the lively imagination of Paul with these metaphors, which are by an easy process of the mind transferred to the believer. The believer is regarded as identified with Christ, and as having a fellowship with him in his sufferings, death, and burial, and also in his resurrection and new spiritual life. Says Paul, Gal ii. 20: "I am crucified with Christ;" and, Rom. vi. 6: "Our old man is crucified with him." Crucifixion is a most painful as well as most lingering death, and every renewed soul can testify, from sore experience, to the death-struggle in his own bosom when he crucified the "old man" and died to sin, *that the body of sin might be destroyed*, that henceforth he should not serve sin, but live unto God. Hence, the believer is enabled to comprehend that contradiction in terms, in which he is represented by the apostle as being both dead and alive at the same time. Col. iii. 3: "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God," and "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20).

2. But another effect of spiritual baptism is a *resurrection* to a new and hidden life. The idea of a spiritual resurrection is not confined to the New Testament, as we have already seen. It occurs in Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones. It also occurs in Eph. i. 18-20; ii. 1-6; and Col. ii. 13; in which believers are represented as being quickened together with Christ, from their spiritually dead condition, and as raised up together with him, and as made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. And this is all ascribed to

the agency of the Spirit, the power of God, the glory of the Father, etc., which he exercised in the resurrection of Christ. And this resurrection is also produced by the baptism, and is a legitimate consequence. As we have already seen, the baptism is spiritual and internal, and so are the crucifixion, the death, and burial, and the resurrection, and, of course, the new life which ensues. "Therefore," says the apostle, Rom. vi. 4, "we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life," or in a new spiritual life. And, again, Col. ii. 12, 13: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein, also, ye are raised with him through the faith of the operation of God;" "and you hath he quickened together with him." It is almost needless to remark here, that the agency employed in this resurrection—the power of God, the faith in that power, called the faith of the operation of God, and the new life brought to view, all clearly involve the idea of a radical, thorough internal change.

This view fully accords with a number of other Scripture passages upon the subject, and possesses all the evidencing power of truth. The apostle says, Gal. ii. 20: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I *live by faith* of the Son of God." "Who his own self bear our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness" (1 Pet. ii. 24). "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. vi. 11). "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Gal. iii. 3). In all these texts, the believer readily recognizes that new and hidden life, which sweetly works by love, and he is constrained to ascribe it wholly to the "one Lord," who suffered and died for him; the "one faith," or system of truth believed and acted upon, and the "one baptism," or regeneration which purifies the heart, and unites the soul to God (Eph. iv. 5); and to join the apostle in the language of exultation, Gal. vi. 14: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." "For, if we have

been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection?" "rooted and built up in him, and established in the faith." Rom. vi. 5, and Col. ii. 7.

3. Finally, another result of spiritual baptism is, a *continued death* unto sin, and a *continued resurrection* unto a life of holiness. The class of texts which we shall adduce under this head, represents the believer as radically changed, as dead to sin and alive to God, and as exercising a living faith, and all the powers of his renewed soul, in making greater attainments in the divine life, or in reaching greater degrees of sanctification. Moreover, what is affirmed in these passages concerning this spiritual change, will not fully apply to what takes place at the moment of conversion, or to what precedes it, but measurably to the exercises of the renewed soul during this present life. What we have to say more under this head, we shall notice in three distinct points of view.

First. Salvation from the power and love of sin. In 1 Peter iii. 21, the apostle, speaking of the salvation of Noah and family in the Ark, makes that transaction to prefigure a baptism which now saves us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, or rather by the resurrecting power of Jesus Christ. And he affirms that it is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," as in the ceremonial ablutions, "but the answer of a good conscience towards God;" a conscience sprinkled by the "blood of Jesus Christ," and purged from dead works to serve the living God. Hear the exhortation of Peter, addressed to such, in the language of the next chapter, which meets a hearty response in the bosom of every new-born soul: "Forasmuch then as Christ has suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind; for he that suffered in the flesh hath cleansed from sins; that he should no longer live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God." Says Paul, Gal. v. 24: "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."

Second. Aspirations after higher attainments in the divine life. Says the apostle Paul, Phil. iii. 8-11: "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ

Jesus my Lord; that I may win Christ and be found in him; that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Here, says Dr. Beecher (p. 101): "Paul desires to know fully and in a spiritual sense, that which corresponds by analogy to those natural changes in Christ—1, sufferings: 2, death; 3, resurrection; 4, experience of divine power; and he shows how he aimed at the spiritual perfection involved in a perfect similitude to these natural events; i. e., a perfect moral crucifixion, death, and resurrection, though he had not yet attained, and was not yet perfect. There is not the least allusion to his own *natural resurrection* here. That would take place, of course, and without any effort on his part; and the law of analogy totally forbids such an interpretation." And Paul, doubtless, realized the consummation of his highest wishes when he could say, near to the close of his life, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth, there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day."

Third. The *attractions* of heaven grow stronger and stronger. The apostle says, Col. ii. 20; iii. 1, etc.: "If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world;" "If ye then be *risen* with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections on things above, not on things on earth. For ye are dead, and your *life is hid with Christ* in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."

The subject of spiritual baptism, or death to sin and resurrection to a life of holiness, realizes an affinity to the family of God; that he is born from above, by the power of the resurrection; that he is bound for heaven, and that his life is hid with Christ in God. He is the happy subject of a conscious assurance of his union with Christ and saving interest in his blood, and he is sure that when Christ, "who is our life," shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation,

then he also shall appear with him in glory, not only with a soul raised and renewed into the divine image, but also with an immortal body, fashioned like unto the glorious resurrection body of our blessed Redeemer—a child of the resurrection and an heir of immortality and *eternal life*.

ART. IX.—Who Was Melchisedec?

I THINK that Melchisedec was a descendant of Canaan, Noah's grand son, as we find that this branch of the great family of Noah settled in Palestine and Syria. It is believed that Canaan died in this region. By reference to Gen. x., the reader will find a complete genealogy. This division of the family (in part) remained in possession of the land of Palestine and of the city of Jerusalem, until David conquered them in A. M., 2956. (See Josh. xv. 63; also, 2 Sam. v. 6.) The first mention of Melchisedec, we find in Gen. xiv. 18. He is mentioned as going, with the King of Sodom, to meet Abram, after his defeat of the five kings. (This was a custom on such occasions in those times.) Melchisedec here blesses Abram, or rather pronounces God's blessing upon Abram, and blesses God for delivering the kings into Abram's hands. In doing this he does not speak as God, but as a man speaks: he speaks as a servant. If he was Christ, as some assume, he would have spoken as God, for he had not taken on humanity yet. The next mention we have of him is in Psa. cx. 4; and the apostle Paul founds an argument upon these two Old Testament passages, in Heb. vi. and vii., where Melchisedec is mentioned as king and as priest, but more fully as priest. In Heb. vii. 1, he is called "king of Salem," as he is in Gen. xiv. 18, and the apostle explains this to mean "king of peace," as Salem means peace. I understand that Salem is but another name for Jerusalem, and

"Jerusalem means the abode of peace." (See Religious Encyclopedia, page 769.) Hence, if he was king of Salem, or Jerusalem, he was king of peace, or of the city of peace. In Heb. vii. 2, he is called "king of righteousness." This has caused some trouble in the minds of some, but by reference to Deut. v. 9, 10; xiv. 8-12; xix. 17-21, and Ezek. xlv. 24, the reader will find that a high priest was at the head of all religious affairs, and was the ordinary judge of all differences that belonged thereto, and even of general justice and judgment of the Jewish nation. Hence, if Melchisedec was king of Salem, he is properly spoken of when he is called king of righteousness, and king of peace. It was his duty to study the peace and purity of those over whom he exercised authority. There were four orders of priesthood: 1. Kings, princes, and heads of families. 2. The order of Melchisedec; which order combined the offices of king, priest, and judge. Melchisedec was raised up of God. 3. The priesthood of Aaron and his sons. This had a succession, and law to govern this succession, and continued as long as the Jewish economy, being handed from one to another in regular order. 4. The priesthood of Christ; which is not confined to any people, but takes in all the world. He, in one particular, in his office, is like Melchisedec—he had no successor. He made a complete offering once for all, combining king, judge, and priest together. I see no difference between Christ as priest and Melchisedec. The duration of both as priests was short; both seem to have been appointed of God. The only difference is one was a type; the other an anti-type. Melchisedec was king and priest to the people while he lived. Christ is all these forever, except priest. He made but one offering, officiated about three years, and suffered once for all on the cross.

I read an article in the April number of the THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, which I now wish to notice for a short time. I quote from page 191: "If he had been simply a man among men, and thus greater than Abraham, would he not have figured correspondingly in the inspired record of the men of that age who were God's servants?" True, he is mentioned once, but if this argument proves any thing, it proves too

much; for if great men are always spoken of in history because of their greatness, then, Christ, being a greater than Melchisedec, ought to have had a still greater record, for he evidently is greater than Abraham or Melchisedec. Again, the priesthood of Melchisedec was of higher order, because he was a high priest of God's special calling, and did not receive office by succession, as did the priests of Aaron's line. He was a type of Christ, and as a high priest had no predecessor or successor, as was the case in Christ. (See Heb. vii. 11.) This verse shows conclusively that the Aaronic priesthood was not the superior priesthood, or there would not have been a necessity of another priesthood, which was after the order of Melchisedec, as in this case. The twelfth verse speaks of a change of priesthood, and, of a necessity, there must be a change of the law, for the reason (verse 13), "he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar;" and (verse 14) "for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." Please notice the two parallel passages as applied. Again (verses 15 and 16): "And it is yet far more evident, for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Now, in these last two verses, Melchisedec and Christ are spoken of, by way of comparison, and Christ is called another priest after the order of Melchisedec. Is he another priest after the order of another, and yet only Christ after his own order? Taking this language, it would be a strange conclusion indeed to arrive at. If Melchisedec is Christ, and only Christ, then certainly the sacred writer took a very round-about way of telling it, as above. On page 191 of the *THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM*, the writer says: "Paul shows the dignity, superiority, etc., of Christ's priesthood, by its connection with Melchisedec," and then argues: "This could not be done unless Melchisedec was Christ." Would a comparison by myself with myself show me any greater? I think not; and if this is true, that is, Christ compared with himself, we are lost in the fog, for Christ is called our "second Adam," or Adam is said to be a type of him who was to

come. (Rom. v. 14.) Is Christ fully represented here according to my good brother's reasoning? I think not, unless the first Adam was also the second Adam. We could bring almost endless proof of this kind, but will only refer to Moses' law on the subject of types. The whole of this law in regard to what they represented, shows conclusively that the type was not up to and equal to what it represented; no more than that wine and bread are actually the body and blood of Christ. They are representations, but inferior to what they represent. The brother's argument here would be good Catholic doctrine; make each piece of bread and drop of wine the blood, body, and divinity of Christ. Let it suffice that Christ's work entire had its types, and none were up to the work in character. They were only shadows, compared to the substance. In regard to Melchisedec, our good brother says, from Heb. vii. 3, that Melchisedec continued a priest. Even this, I think, has reference to succession. He had no successor or predecessor, like Christ, in this respect. The writer argues, because Christ is spoken of in Heb. vi. 20, and vii. 17, as "a high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec," that we have two high priests forever at the same time. I cannot see how he comes to that conclusion. Christ made but one offering as high priest. He offered himself on the tree of the cross long after Melchisedec's day. Both ceased on earth and have gone up to their reward. I think all this has reference to succession only, for if Christ was a priest after the order of Christ, as the brother argues; if he was a priest after the order of himself, and had been on earth before, I get into trouble again, for I read in Heb. ix. 28, that he is to "appear the second time, without sin unto salvation." If Christ was here under the name of Melchisedec once, and again as Christ, and finally is to come as judge, this will bring him the third time, instead of the second, as quoted above. Again: the writer argues, because there is a likeness between Christ and Melchisedec, they are one and the same. This he derives from Heb. vii. 2, 3, and gives a quotation from John i.: "In the beginning was the Word," etc. The inspired writer here speaks of the glory of Christ, and not of the man. The glory was like the glory of the Son of man.

He does not make a comparison at all; but in the case of priesthood, he does make a comparison. I have cited the reader to Christ as our second Adam, etc.; let this suffice. Jesus says, through his inspired apostle: "It does not appear what we shall be, but when he shall appear we shall be like him." Does this argue because "we shall be like him," that we are really and truly Christ? Again, we were in the image or likeness of God when created; does this prove us to be gods really and truly? Language is, indeed, flexible, but not so much so that its true meaning may be wrenched from it; not so much so that we can make ourselves gods or christs; or Melchisedec and Christ, one and the same. No, never, just simply because we have a resemblance or likeness to each other. From Phil. ii. 6, "Who, being in the form of God," etc., the writer makes more proof. The apostle in this scripture is urging the brethren to oneness of mind. In the the second verse he says, "Be of one mind;" third verse, "Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory; but each esteem other better than themselves;" fifth verse, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus;" sixth verse, "Who, being in the form of God;" seventh verse, "Was in the form of a servant," etc. This whole argument of the apostle is made use of to urge the Philippians to oneness of mind, purpose, feelings, etc., and not to prove that Christ was God, a servant, or man. Again, our brother quotes Col. i. 15, where Christ is called the image of the invisible God, and argues that Christ is God. From this shall I understand he means that the flesh or body of Christ, which is visible, is the image of the invisible God? I cannot see it in that light. We must keep before us a perfect distinction between the humanity and the divinity of Christ. I understand from what we can gather from the manifestations of power and glory seen in the actions of Christ in healing the sick, raising the dead, etc., that there is seen the express image of God. For, so far as the humanity of Christ is concerned, unassociated with divinity, there would be no more of the express image of the invisible God, than in my good brother or any other good man. Again, he refers to Christ being called the Son of man. This has reference to him as a man only. The writer is cer-

tainly not going to make the flesh God? If so, all men being alike, are gods, and doing God's service. Again, he says that the name Melchisedec could not be properly applied to man, because this name means "king of righteousness." If he was a high priest, he was king of righteousness, just as certainly as he was king of Salem; unless we assume that there never was another king, except Christ, and there never was another high priest who was a type of Christ, except Christ himself, and there never was any type except Christ. You must not call your boy Peter, because this means a stone; and, hence, you cannot call a boy a stone, for he is not a stone. Again, the writer says: "The expression, 'without father, without mother,' etc., is only applicable to Christ." Does the good brother pretend to say that Christ is without father or mother? Mary is said to have been his mother and God his Father, and so far as his humanity is concerned, he had beginning of days and end of time; was born in a manger and died on the cross; but as a priest, he was like the type, Melchisedec; he is king of an endless kingdom, he will be judge of all, but not now; he is a priest and made one perfect offering; had no predecessor or successor in this offering. So of the type; no record exists showing a predecessor or successor to Melchisedec. A priest made of God, and not in the regular order or line of Aaron and his priesthood, is all that is contemplated in this whole matter. Again, the writer says: "Paul was writing to a people among whom the loss of genealogical record would have a damaging effect," etc. I do not wonder that Paul should do this very thing, and especially when the Jews were in part looking to genealogy to save them. They said: "We have Abraham to our father; have never been strangers and foreigners." If Melchisedec was truly Christ, and without father or mother, in their estimation, this would be very damaging indeed. If a mere priest would be so very much damaged, certainly to him as Christ, as high priest who has no type or genealogy, it would be much more so, according to our brother. Again, Melchisedec appeared before Jewish genealogy began. I see another good lesson to those Jews in this, the same that was taught Peter when the sheet was let down to prove to him that God had

other followers, before the day of the Jews, and outside of the Jewish Church. Again, our brother objects to Melchisedec being a type of Christ, because his time was so short. I wonder how long Christ continued a priest on earth, and how many offerings did he make? Let us look at Heb. ix. 12. It is here said: "He entered in once into the holy place." Christ made a short work, only about thirty-three years in all on earth, unless this was he who is spoken of under the name of Melchisedec; and only about three years in all engaged in all the duties pertaining to his work on earth, and we have seen, naturally speaking, he has a genealogy; and also spiritually, God being his Father. The writer admits at last the very points involved in this whole matter, that is in regard to his predecessor, etc., as priest. Read what Paul calls the conclusion or sum of the whole matter, in Heb. viii. He shows that the covenant and sacrifices and priesthood were inferior, and that they were only patterns of better things. This had to be done to take the human plank out of the Jewish platform (that is, succession): "We have Abraham to our father," said they. I do not wonder that Paul labors so much with the Jews, and we have some among us clinging to succession. Priests must be made by them, or they are no priests at all; must have proper genealogy, or they have no authority. This evidently is what the Jews had been taught under Aaron and his successors in office. They thought, no doubt, there was no other authority but Aaron's. Melchisedec and Christ were of other tribes as priests and officers in their various relations. They were without beginning of days or end of time. No one ceased as priest to give place to them, nor took their place at the close of their term of office. This is all, I think, there is in this part of the subject. I conclude that Melchisedec was of some tribe of Canaan, of those who remained and were conquered by David and the Israelites. In his time, he was a high priest of God; a type of Christ, having no genealogy in office. So far as we know, very little was recorded until the days of the Jews; hence this record is in perfect keeping with the age, and is a good thing for some Jews, and Christians, too, who claim a priestly succession.

For if we require a succession in one age, we must do so all the way along the history of the Church.

Here I will rest this discussion. I wish our good brother well in every respect.

ART. X.—*Antitheses in Christ.*

THE most useful and convincing evidence that can be presented in favor of the character and mission of the Saviour, can be derived from a comparison of the book of revelation with the book of nature. The grand plan of creation is one of antithetical dualities: the earth presents an ever-changing face to the sun, and the moon presents a never-changing face to the earth; the earth is composed of dry land and water; in the Eastern Hemisphere the land lies parallel with the equator, and, in the Western, the land is perpendicular to the equator. Among the animals of the earth, the gigantic whale feeds on animalcules, and animalcules feed on gigantic animals; and so on through all the realms of nature.

The Bible, properly examined, is arranged on the same plan. The first book tells us of the darkness which brooded on the face of the great deep, and the last tells us of the New Jerusalem, where there will be no darkness whatever. There are mentioned many striking antitheses—Abel and Cain, Abraham and Nahor, Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, David and Saul, etc., the one accepted and the other rejected in each case. I propose now to show that all the specifications concerning, and characteristics of, the Saviour can and ought to be classified in the same antithetical manner; and we shall have an array of evidence for the truth of his high mission which will defy the most acute skeptic or deist that ever lived.

Let us turn, then, to this Saviour, who, as God in the image of man, filled the duality which the creation of Adam in the image of God required; who, to the first Adam, created a living soul becoming subject to death, was antithetical as a

quickening or life-giving spirit; who, antithetically, brings life by his obedience to those upon whom Adam brought death by his disobedience; who, as an eternal law-giver, was antithetical to Moses in his character as temporal law-giver; who, as the minister of the new covenant, "which giveth life," enjoys a glory which shall never be done away; and was antithetical to Moses, the minister of the covenant of "the letter which killeth;" the glory of whose countenance was to be done away (2 Cor. iii.); who, as a successful leader, was antithetical to Moses, an unsuccessful leader. Moses left Egypt at eighty years of age, at the head of several millions of people, only two of whom ever reached the promised rest; the Saviour left Egypt, an infant, accompanied by only two persons, but he will triumphantly lead innumerable millions of his followers into the promised rest.

This Saviour, who, as an eternal prophet or teacher, was antithetical to the Jewish prophets or teachers, temporal prophets or teachers; who, also, as a teacher, never spoke a single parable without introducing antithetical characters or characteristics; who, made a priest with an oath, was antithetical to the Jewish priests, who became priests without an oath; who, established in an eternal priesthood, was antithetical to the Jewish priests, established in a temporal priesthood, and constantly changed "by reason of death;" who, as a priest, was ready to offer a victim, yet was himself the victim to be offered; who, as a victim whose blood "could take away sins," was antithetical to the victims offered on Jewish altars, whose blood "could not take away sins;" who, as a priest in whom perfection existed, was antithetical to the Jewish priests in whom perfection did not exist; who, made a priest from a tribe of which "Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood," was antithetical to the Jewish priests, who were strictly confined to the tribe of Levi; who, made a priest "after the power of an endless life," was antithetical to the Jewish priests, who were made priests after the "law of a carnal commandment" (Heb. vii. 16); who, because "he continueth ever," hath an unchangeable priesthood, and is able to save them to the uttermost that come to God by him, was antithetical to the Jewish priests, who were not able to

save those who came to God by them; who, though a priest, yet was a king, and was, therefore, antithetical to the Jewish priests, who were not allowed on a throne; who, as a king, "to whose kingdom there shall be no end," was antithetical to all other kings, to whose kingdoms an end will surely come; who, as our high priest, has entered a holy of holies, wherein all is light, and thereby become antithetical to the Jewish high priests, who entered a holy of holies, wherein not a single ray of external light was allowed to enter. As a high priest, Jesus Christ was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners"; who made only one offering and had no need to offer a daily sacrifice, as if for his own sins, and for the sins of the people, and was, therefore, antithetical to the Jewish high priest, who was obliged to offer a daily sacrifice for his own sins and for the sins of the people. Jesus Christ, as a high priest, became the minister of a tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and was antithetical to the Jewish high priest, who was a minister of a tabernacle which men pitched. As a mediator of a covenant which was faultless and could never decay and wax old, the Saviour was antithetical to the Jewish high priest, who was a mediator of a covenant which was not faultless, and which did decay and wax old and did vanish away; being "nailed to the cross" (Heb. viii.), he was a high priest who entered a holy of holies bearing his own blood, and was antithetical to the Jewish high priest that entered the holy place bearing blood not his own; who, as a high priest who entered a holy of holies, bearing blood "which could take away sins," was antithetical to the Jewish high priest that entered the holy place bearing blood which could not take away sins; who, though a king, yet became a subject; who, though a master, yet became a servant; who, though the owner of all things, yet was so poor he had not where to lay his head; who came preaching the doctrine of love to enemies, yet he came not to bring peace, but a sword; who came preaching the pardon of sins, and yet antithetically excepted one sin which could not be forgiven; who came to John for baptism not confessing any sins, but "to fulfill all righteousness," and was, therefore, antithetical to the Jews who came to John confessing their

sins; whose dead body, as a man, was buried in the grave of Joseph of Arimathea, whence, as a God, he came forth a triumphant conqueror; who, though executed as a criminal, will come as a judge; who, at his first coming, came to save men from the penalties due their sins, but at his second coming will inflict the penalties due the sins of the unrighteous; whose second coming will be hailed with delight by the righteous, and with horror by the unrighteous who will call upon the rocks and the mountains to hide them from his wrath. He was executed as a criminal, yet he was innocent of all crime, and was antithetical to the criminals executed with him; who was pierced with a spear, while the others were not so pierced; who had not a bone broken while on the cross, though the others had their bones broken; who was reviled by one criminal on one side, and revered by the other on the opposite side; who promised a place in paradise to the repentant thief, but made no promise to the unrepentant thief; who, as the anointed Saviour, was antithetical to Satan, the unanointed destroyer. This wonderful character is introduced to us in Revelation with antithetical titles and characteristics.

The titles of Jesus Christ are—

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The Son of God,
Luke i. 35. | and The Everlasting Father.
Isa. ix. 6. |
| 2. The Son of God,
Luke i. 35. | " The Son of Man.
Matt. viii. 20. |
| 3. The Alpha,
Rev. i. 8. | " The Omega.
Rev. i. 8. |
| 4. The First,
Rev. i. 17. | " The Last.
Rev. i. 17. |
| 5. The Beginning,
Rev. xxii. 13. | " The End.
Rev. xxii. 13. |
| 6. The Author of Our Faith,
Heb. xii. 2. | " The Finisher of Our Faith.
Heb. xii. 2. |
| 7. The Lamb of God,
John i. 29. | " The Good Shepherd.
John x. 12. |
| 8. The Lamb of God,
John i. 29. | " The Lion of the Tribe of Judah.
Rev. v. 5. |
| 9. He that Liveth,
Rev. i. 18. | " Was Dead.
Rev. i. 18. |
| 10. The Branch,
Jer. xxiii. 5; Zech. iii. 8. | " The True Vine.
John xv. 1. |
| 11. The King of Kings,
Rev. xvii. 14. | " "Then Shall the Son himself be
Subject," 1 Cor. xv. 28. |
| 12. A Master,
Eph. vi. 9. | " A Servant.
Phil. ii. 7. |
| 13. The Desire of all Nations,
Hag. ii. 7. | " Despised and Rejected of Men.
Isa. liii. 3. |

In characteristics, he is antithetical to Satan, the destroyer. Satan was expelled from heaven: Jesus left heaven voluntarily, and "took upon himself the form of a servant;" Satan was a sinner from the beginning: Jesus was without sin; Satan is said to be like a roaring lion: Jesus is styled the Lamb of God; Satan is an accuser: Jesus is an excuser, who intercedes for us; Satan is a deceiver: Jesus is a true guide; Satan is an adversary: Jesus is our advocate and true friend; Satan is a tormenter: Jesus, a comforter; Satan hinders the righteous: Jesus assists them; Satan is styled the prince of this world: Jesus was an humble associate of poor fishermen, and was so poor he had not where to lay his head; Satan takes away the Word of God from the children of men: Jesus gives them the Word of God; Satan turns men away to darkness: Jesus turns men to light; Satan tempts men to sin: Jesus persuades men to righteoutness; Satan is an angel of the bottomless pit: Jesus sits on the throne of heaven.

The career of this extraordinary being was also antithetical.

* "The fiat of Jehovah had gone forth: 'The soul that sinneth it surely shall die.' How could the sinner be saved without falsifying the threats of Infinite Truth and Holiness? A mediator, a substitute must be found. Some one must die. If he were all human, his death would be but the penalty of his own sins, and would afford no expiation. If he were all divine, he would be incapable of suffering or dying, and could render no atonement. He must be both human and divine. Human to suffer—divine that his sufferings might be efficacious and infinite in extent.

Jesus Christ was this Mediator, this Saviour. He alone, of all the beings who ever trod or ever will tread the surface of this sin-cursed globe, possessed this double nature, was this God-man. As a man, born in a stable in Bethlehem; as a God, his birth hailed by legions of angels, whose refulgent splendors and heavenly harmonies dazzle and astound the shepherds on Judea's lonely hills. As a man, cradled in a manger. As a God, receiving the adoration and gifts of the Eastern magi, led to his lowly couch by a gleaming world of

* Donan's *Caucasian*, 1872, No. 331: Lexington, Mo. Lines in brackets additions by the author of this article.

meteoric light. ^{as} As a man, wrapped in the deep sleep of the weary in that frail, tempest-tossed bark on Gennesareth. ^{As} As a God, calming the raging winds and lulling the billows with the omnipotent words, "Peace, be still." ^{As} As a man, pitying the fainting multitude in the wilderness of Decapolis. ^{As} As a God, feeding the famishing thousands with miracle-created bread and fishes." ^{As} [As a man, he became accursed; yet as a God, he is on the throne of heaven dispensing blessings to the universe. ^{As} As a man, he was led by the Holy Spirit anterior to his death; subsequent to his death, he, as God, sent the Holy Spirit at his will. ^{As} As a man, "there was no comeliness in him." ^{As} As a God, his face glorified on the mount of transfiguration with the splendor of the sun; his garments became white as the light, and now he "is altogether lovely." ^{As} As a man, he was crowned on earth with a crown of thorns, spit upon and buffeted. ^{As} As a God, crowned in heaven King of King and Lord of Lords, supreme over the universe.] ^{As} "As a man, weeping at the grave of Lazarus, his friend." ^{As} As a God, commanding the dead to come forth, and restoring him to his weeping sisters. ^{As} As a man, paying tribute to Caesar. ^{As} As a God, compelling the fish of the sea to disgorge the needed coin. ^{As} As a man, suffering hunger, thirst, weariness, poverty, and abuse. ^{As} As a God, healing the sick, cleansing the lepers, casting out devils, restoring the limbs of the halt and the maimed, giving sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, making the dumb to speak, and raising the dead to life. ^{As} As a man, groaning in unutterable agony and sweating great drops of blood beneath the dark olive trees of Gethsemane's garden. ^{As} As a God, felling the armed rabble to the earth by a look, and replacing that fear of the high priest's servant with a single touch. ^{As} As a man, bleeding, dying upon Calvary's cross. ^{As} As a God, bestowing paradise upon the repentant thief at his side. ^{As} As a man, pouring out his anguished soul in the piteous cry, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani." ^{As} As a God, praying for his murderers, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." ^{As} As a man, meekly bowing his head and breathing out his spirit in that redemption-assuring murmur, "It is finished." ^{As} As a God, all nature convulsed with mortal terror at his death, the sun hid

behind a pall of funeral woe, the solid earth trembling to its center with mysterious awe, the very graves yawning forth their sheeted tenants, and the veil of Judea's proud temple rent in twain, to show that it no longer screened the Holy of Holies. As a man, buried in Joseph's tomb. As a God, bursting the bars of death on the morning of the self-appointed third day, and rising, triumphant over hell and the grave, with a glory which prostrated even the pagan soldiery about the sepulchre as dead men upon the ground. As a man, eating a piece of broiled fish and of a honey-comb with his doubting disciples, and permitting Thomas to thrust his fingers into the nail-prints in his hands, and the cruel hole torn by a Roman spear in his side. As a God, swept up in a cloud from the sight of his adoring followers to the right hand of the Father in heaven, where he ever liveth to make intercession for man."

As a man, seen entering Jerusalem mounted on an ass, and human beings singing his praises. As a God, escorted to the courts of heaven by all the angelic hosts, who triumphantly cried out, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle. Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory" (Psa. xxiv); and thus, amid the resounding acclamations of angels and archangels, this only God-man took his place at the right hand of the Father, where he will reign until all things shall have been put beneath his feet.

Now, let all infidels and deists and Jews take up the above and explain to us, upon the doctrine of chances, how men living at various times, through 1500 years, all managed to calculate so perfectly every time as did the writers of the Bible; or, to use a different figure, how workmen living at various times through 1500 years, without any architect to guide them, all dressed out their work so that every stone dropped into its appropriate place, and made a structure far more wonderful than Solomon's temple. If they reason logically,

they will certainly conclude that the God of heaven planned the work, and superintended the execution of it through the whole time; and that his revelation of Jesus Christ ought to be believed, and the commands of the Saviour ought to be obeyed.

BOOK NOTICES.

MEMOIRS OF REV. CHARLES G. FINNEY. Written by Himself.
New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1876.

Here we have a most marvelous record. It is a history of one main feature, *the* great fact in the life of one who labored as an evangelist with wonderful power and success for a long term of years. There is so much of interest and instruction in this handsome and large duodecimo volume, that we shall not be able to make our readers appreciate it at all, we fear. We heartily wish that every minister in the Church could get it and read it. There are many points of resemblance between the history of the early struggles and difficulties of Charles G. Finney and that of our Cumberland Presbyterian fathers. He never had the conflicts which they waged in fighting their way to the distinctive place of a denomination of Christians, but he had the same sort of intellectual and spiritual troubles which they suffered in settling their exact grounds of doctrinal faith and practical work.

His father's family, from its head down to the youngest child, was not Christian, and, therefore, he was never taught the Christian faith in its practical or theoretical aspects, except as he observed it in others or heard it from the pulpit. His early experience was one of great ignorance of the teachings of the Bible, and was not favored then with the light of a consecrated and cultivated ministry. When a young man, entering upon the study and practice of law, he found himself

for the first time face to face with a man of Princeton Seminary training, who was pastor of the church which he attended, but this man was thoroughly hampered by the strict theology of the Old School of divines, and, to Finney, he appeared to be completely in "a straight jacket." One influence and another moved young Finney to commence for himself the careful study of the Bible, and he was led to see the errors in the doctrinal creed of his pastor. Mr. Gale, the pastor, became convinced that the young man was a hardened, although a highly enlightened youth, and that the hope of his conversion was very small. They had frequent conversations, which took the decided form of controversy, which continued a considerable time. The spiritual life of Finney was, therefore, anything but encouraging. But God was leading him by a way which he knew not, and in paths he had not known, and was giving him a very profound and clear experience of divine grace, in order that he might be the instrument of a mighty and extensive work among men. Being left almost wholly to the guidance of the Spirit and the Word of God, without intelligent and spiritual instruction from the minister or people of the church, his way was thorny and dark; but ultimately, in spite of bristling theological difficulties and the want of sympathy, instruction, and similar experience in others, he was enabled to emerge from the dense shades of natural ignorance of God's grace into the clear, serene light of the Sun of righteousness, which arose upon his soul's sky with healing in his beams. When brought to see God in the face of Jesus Christ so gloriously reconciled, his spirit overflowed with unutterable joy, and his peace ran like a deep, broad, clear, and resistless river. Its current bore away every vestige of doubt and difficulty, spiritual and intellectual, and gave him the brightest and sweetest views of all the landscapes of grace and salvation. Thus qualified by personal experience of the truth and power of God in conversion and abounding spiritual joy, he instantly became convinced of the imperative duty to preach the gospel to sinners, and the necessity of going right at it. He had agreed to plead the cause of a certain Deacon B. in court, and, on the morning after his conversion, the Deacon came to tell him that the case was to

be tried at ten o'clock that forenoon, and he asked Mr. Finney whether he was ready. His instant reply was, "Deacon B., I have a retainer from the Lord Jesus Christ to plead his cause, and I cannot plead yours." When asked what he meant, Mr. Finney answered as before, meaning that he felt called at once to preach the gospel, and that some one else must be employed to attend the law-suit. Deacon B. was so deeply impressed with the young man's spirit and manner, that he went off and settled his suit at once, and became a much better Christian.

The same morning on which this incident occurred, when Squire W., the lawyer under whom he studied, and with whom his office still was, came into the office, young Finney immediately spoke to him about his soul in such a manner as to lead subsequently to his conversion. These things having occurred, he set out to tell "the old, old story of Jesus and his love," to everybody he should meet, and the result of his first day's labor was the conversion of quite a number of souls. His own conversion had been so clear, so decisive, and so joyful, that he was perfectly possessed by the thought that he must preach to others the present and powerful salvation which he had experienced. His relation of his experience, in the "Memoirs," is replete with interest to every regenerated soul, and it reminds the reader forcibly of the doctrine and the experience of all who believe in the truth of conviction for sin by the influence of the Holy Spirit, and the realization of conscious comfort upon the pardon of sin by faith in Jesus Christ. His conversion startled the whole community where he lived, and the minister was more thoroughly surprised than any one else, it would seem, because he had gone so far in his view of the condition of Finney, as to advise some of the members of his congregation not to pray for the hardened young man, when a proposition had been made to unite in prayer in his behalf, believing the case hopeless. All this shows the obstacles in the way of the salvation of the gifted and independent young man, and it placed the stamp of decision and of power upon him, all the more that he was converted in spite of so many opposing influences. His was

sense very familiar in the annals of Cumberland Presbyterian history, and his summary of his experience in a few words, has often been repeated without any knowledge that he ever expressed it. He said: "I could see that the moment I believed, while up in the woods, all sense of condemnation had entirely dropped out of my mind; and that from that moment I could not feel a sense of guilt or condemnation by any effort that I could make. My sense of guilt was gone; my sins were gone; and I do not think I felt any more sense of guilt than if I never had sinned." This was just the revelation that I needed. I felt myself justified by faith. My cup ran over with blessing and with love, and I could not feel that I was sinning against God. A great and gracious revival followed upon Mr. Finney's conversion, and it spread out over the country in various directions. Many were led to Christ, the Church was largely built up, and the good cause assumed a powerful form. He shortly after visited his father and mother, and was instrumental in leading them to Jesus. Finney's continued experience of God's grace, and his breadth of view upon the fullness and efficacy of the atonement of Jesus Christ, from the date of his conversion, were very remarkable under the circumstances. His conversion occurred in the autumn of 1821, and he died August 16, 1875, almost eighty-three years old, and during that long period of time he preached the gospel with great power from place to place as an evangelist, visiting first obscure rural districts and villages, then one town and city after another, until he had proclaimed a broad and glorious gospel in a vast number of places, including Philadelphia, New York, Boston, etc., in the United States, and Birmingham, Manchester, Edinburgh, and London, in Great Britain. Thousands upon thousands of persons professed religion in the revival meetings which he held, and in London, at one time, the anxious inquirers were so numerous that an immense school-room which held more than fifteen hundred, was crowded to overflowing with individuals seeking religion. It was supposed that two thousand arose for prayer at one call. It is impossible for man to tell the extent of the influence of Mr. Finney in his career as an evangelist.

He was one of those peculiar men whose power is perfectly unique. Such was Whitefield, such was John Wesley, such was Jonathan Edwards, such was Nettleton, such was Robert Donnell, such was Daniel Baker, and such are Hammond, Earle, and Moody. Without them and their spiritual fire, there would be much longer nights of religious indifference and barrenness in the history of the Church than those which do come in spite of all quickening and illuminating influences.

The theology of Charles G. Finney was a type of that "New School" theology which grew with the years of his growth until it brought on trials for heresy, many heart-burnings, and public discussions, and eventuated in the rupture of the Presbyterian Church in 1837. His views were highly original and in a strong sense self-evolved. They were the results of his study of the Bible, and in direct conflict with the prevailing theology of the Presbyterian Church, and, especially, of the minister under whom he studied. This Mr. Finney claims distinctly in recording his repeated controversies with his teacher, Rev. Mr. Gale. He says: "We went over the whole field of debate between the Old and the New School divines, upon the subject of the atonement, as my subsequent theological studies taught me. I do not recollect to have ever read a page upon the subject, except what I found in the Bible. I had never, to my recollection, heard a sermon or any discussion whatever upon the question." Finney denied the doctrines of "original sin" and "imputation," as taught by Presbyterians, calling that of imputation a "theological fiction." Upon the depravity of human nature, he seems to have been unsound, one of his statements of his views containing this expression: "I insisted upon the voluntary total moral depravity of the unregenerate." That is, man is not *naturally* totally depraved, according to Mr. Finney, but *voluntarily* so. He preached a free and full salvation for all men, and emphasized this with great power and success wherever he went.

It is a very pleasing feature of this volume of four hundred and seventy-seven pages, that although Mr. Finney began his labors as a college president and professor in 1835, and con

tinued them until his death, there is not much in proportion about the college enterprise in the book. Of course, there is a record of his connection and of the results to some extent, but these "Memoirs" are given up entirely almost to the great work of the author's life; that is, evangelism. They are replete with most remarkable incidents of personal character relating to himself and to others who were specially subjects of the revivals of which he was the leading instrument. It is on this account, particularly, that we commend the work to our readers; for it will not only prove deeply interesting and very instructive to all who read it, but it will afford to ministers many a suggestion of great value in the conduct of revival meetings. There are some things which we set down to the very pronounced personality of Mr. Finney, for which he alone is responsible to God and posterity, but the study of the history of such a man can but be useful in a high degree to every Christian, as exemplifying forcibly the providence of God over his Church, and the variety of men and measures by which the human mind must be brought to give attention to the ultimate and grandest interests of the soul.

The style of these "Memoirs" is decidedly colloquial, and the author, in dealing with his own life and work, seems to care little to dress up any thought or scene in fine terms for the pleasure of those who regard rhetoric more highly than they do piety or the power of the simple truth. The narrative interest is sometimes intense and the reality of the facts very thorough, so that the reader feels, at times, as if he were a part of the living elements at work in the development of the wonderful results. While differing widely with the author on many questions, the reader can but sympathize with the deep earnestness he exhibits everywhere, and admire the boldness and power with which he evidently accomplished the great mission of his life. We frankly confess that, no matter how seriously we may differ with a man on questions of secondary importance in theology or church polity, we do heartily honor every earnest, bold, spiritual herald of the cross of Christ, no matter to what ecclesiastical body he may

belong, and we bid him a sincere "God speed" in his glorious career.

We place this "Autobiography of Finney" alongside of "The Life of Robert Newton," that giant of Wesleyan Methodism; of "The Life of Justin Edwards," that marvelous embodiment of unflagging Christian energy among the Congregationalists; of "The Life of Adoniram Judson," that grand missionary apostle of the Baptist Church; and of other standard lives of representative characters in other branches of the Christian Church, and all these we freely put side by side with "The Life and Times of Ewing" and "The Life of Rev. George Donnell," of our own beloved Zion. The grand, fundamental principles of evangelical Christianity are held and taught by all those to whom we have alluded, and we bless God that there is no monopoly of divine grace, or of the graces and gifts of spiritual life in any one denomination of Christians.

If you, reader, wish a rich treat, much benefit, and most valuable information, send two dollars for the "Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney" to A. S. Barnes & Co., 111 and 113 Williams street, New York City, and, we need not add, be sure to read it.

ACHSAH: A NEW ENGLAND LIFE-STUDY. By Rev. Peter Pen-
not. Boston: Lee & Shepard, Publishers. 1876.

A neat volume, 12mo., of three hundred and sixty-eight pages, from that prolific establishment in Boston, so many of whose publications we have noticed in this Quarterly. We began the book pleasantly, read awhile with a gathering frown on our orthodox brow, read on and on, and gradually let the frown fade away in the shadows of receding theological opinion, and became deeply interested in the "life-study" of some New England characters. Well, "it is strange, passing strange," that in the same village, brought up under the same phases of civilization, and under nearly the same features of religious belief, there should be people who differ in character as widely in important respects as the antipodes of our big earth. Their mental processes and spiritual life appear to be radically at variance, and that, too, despite the fact that the unlovely is often seen in one who holds the faith

of the orthodox with great tenacity and scrupulousness, and the gentle and attractive are found in him or her who is eminently noted for what is called "Liberalism." This can be accounted for on principles of practical philosophy, and it should by no means cast reflection upon the evangelical faith of the Church, on the one hand, or unduly credit the grace of character seen in a certain person to the heretical doctrines which he may hold, on the other. Among the sternest but most unworthy of ancient religionists, in the days of our Lord, were those orthodox hypocrites, the Pharisees. We are ready to admit the truth of history in all cases, but we do not forget that the "Liberals" of those times were the ungodly and corrupt Sadducees, who were in authority when our Saviour was put to death. Taken all in all, without prejudice, commend to us the full, glorious gospel of Christ, in its richest evangelical view, for making good men and women, and, therefore, for making this world happy. There is not heart enough in negation, in "liberalism," in "free religion." They are too fine-spun, too sentimental, too ethereal too far out of the reach of those profound needs of human nature, which are the common heritage of our fallen race, to demonstrate themselves as of God. This life is a variety of real facts, and many of them are dark-browed, sad, and sorrowful. Man's heart needs and seeks substantial comfort, solid and abiding rest in its innermost experience. Exceptional Owen Roods are not to blind our eyes to the everyday men and women of this world of sin and want. That fine balance of character which gives one Owen Rood such superiority in the circle of his associations is not the common lot of humanity; and there are many weaknesses to be helped in hours of need, which naught but the vital energy of the gospel of Christ can relieve. Those who read "Achsah" will find in the first two chapters of the book the ground for these reflections. We might give the reader farther insight into its character by details; but we close this notice by saying that the story is well told, and it suggests some good lessons. Those who wish the book can have it sent directly from the hands of the publishers for \$1.75, postage paid, if we mistake not.

AUTOLOGY: An Inductive System of Mental Science; Whose Center is the Will, and Whose Completion is the Personality. A Vindication of the Manhood of Man, the Godhood of God, and the Divine Authorship of Nature. By Rev. D. H. Hamilton, D. D. Boston: Lee & Shepard, Publishers. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham.

This is an octavo volume of seven hundred and nineteen pages, well printed, in rather small type, and it, therefore, contains a vast amount of matter. It claims to be an exhaustive examination of the *science of self*. The *General Contents* have the following divisions, viz: Explanatory Introduction. Then, Part I—The Will; Part II—The Affections; Part III—The Intellect; Part IV—The Conscience; Part V—The Personality; and a *Critical Appendix*. The publishers make an *Announcement*, in which they state thirty-five considerations why “this system of mental science commends itself to attention.” We cannot present all these “considerations,” but a few of them will give the drift of view, and enable the reader to define to himself a somewhat correct idea of the scope of the work. Beginning with the first, they say: “The live question of the age and the hour is this: ‘God or no God?’ ‘Theism or Atheism?’ or, in specific terms, ‘Is God a person, or only a force?’ 2. This vital question, with those affiliated with it, the Autology meets and answers; it is, therefore, the book for the times. 3. The method is inductive, and the style is at once logical and illustrative; it is, therefore, a book for both the scientist and the people.” Omitting the fourth consideration, the fifth is this: “The Autology is not simply a book, but a system; not a mere collection of essays or lectures, but a complete and unified treatise, having one vital principle, and one homogeneous identity and life. 6. This work is original, in that it brings out new truth, re-states, re-defines, and uses old truths in such a way that they have the force of new ones. It is not, therefore, simply another volume on a known subject, but decidedly a new system of mental science, having a distinct and thoroughly marked individuality.” In the fourteenth consideration, it is said: “The whole subject of knowing is treated in a manner altogether peculiar to this author—all knowing being divided into absolute knowledge and relative

knowledge. 15. The absolute knowing of primary facts is by the consciousness. 16. The absolute knowing of ideas is by reason." Numbers twenty-one and twenty-two say: "Relative knowing is by the reason, with its adjunct, the senses, and by means of the ideas and categories formed from the facts of consciousness. In this way, the reason believes, perceives, cognizes, remembers, conceives, ratiocinates, imagines, invents, idealizes, and performs all the acts of relative knowledge." Number twenty-five says: "The conscience is the highest faculty of the mind, and is the ultimate outgrowth of all the preceding faculties. It is formed by the coming together and coalescence of the original elements of essential activity and essential intelligence, after they have formed all the other faculties, and as they crop out at the summit of the soul, completing its development as a competent and accountable being. 26. The whole man, with all its faculties of body and mind, constitutes the complete personality." Last, number thirty-two states that "the personal God is shown to be the true dynamics of the universe, and the ultimate fact of all science."

We have had this extensive work on hand for a considerable time, and it was intended to give it a lengthy and careful review. But when we found it impracticable to bestow sufficient time and attention upon it to do it any thing like justice, we committed it into the hands of a distinguished brother, who kept it many months hoping, vainly, to find time to prepare the review, and then asked to be allowed to return it, as the necessary leisure could not be obtained from pressing duties. Had he reviewed it, we should, without doubt, have been favored with an able examination of the positions of the author. We have read sufficiently to see that the work is the result of much care and time, and it will repay any thoughtful man to read it. Some of the statements are finely expressed, as, for example, this: "The works of Edwards and Kant are the cooled and hardened masses of lava thrown out from the volcanic depths of the human mind by the eruptions of its own metaphysical fires. In these vast masses, strown roughly along the rugged steepes of study and inquiry, are found many precious stones and valu-

able metals, with much of baser matter, such as mere cinders, ashes, and debris. Many questions are presented in this volume that impinge at various points upon the work of the ministry, and, therefore, any minister would, in all probability, be benefited by careful perusal of its contents. The book is not all a dry metaphysical discussion, but many thoroughly interesting and attractive passages, and even chapters, occur. And whatever else may be said about it, this work is under the control of Christian faith, and it utters some of the most evangelical sentiments.

Five dollars sent to the publishers will secure this grand book, which will amply repay care in perusal.

PRINCIPIA, OR BASIS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE. Being a Survey of the Subject from the Moral and Theological, yet Liberal and Progressive Stand-point. By R. J. Wright. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1875.

We cannot review at any length this large octavo volume of five hundred and twenty-four pages. It is a handsome production, and it treats a most important part of the vast world of science. The work noticed just previously to this, treated specifically of the *individual*; this book treats of the community of individuals under five general divisions, viz: I.—Summary Introduction to Social Science: under which are general views, definitions, scope, uses, classifications, etc., of this science, and "principles of society itself" in various respects. II.—The Precinct: under which are considered the theory of the precinct or neighborhood, arguments for the precinct, charters, etc. III.—The Nation: as a fundamental element; its rights, duties, uses, birth, and size; international law, naturalization, etc. IV.—Corporations: in religion and morals, in politics and parties, in education, in trade, etc., etc., under which head is a very extensive range of views. V.—Limited Communism: under this head, the nature, foundations, etc., of communism are considered. The author seems to us to lay special stress upon his views on this last general division of his work. He thinks there is great good in communism under proper restrictions.

The author places particular estimate upon what he calls the "theory of the six units," as he says in general terms:

"We have now come to what we suppose to be one of the most original and valuable parts of our theory, namely, that human society, and, therefore, social science, each consists of six fundamental elements, or units; namely, Individual, Family, Social Circle, Precinct, Nation, and Mankind." He endeavors to present his readers a discriminating view of the great questions discussed, in the light of manifold opinions of distinguished writers on the subject, such as Comte, Paley, Spencer, Mill, etc. In speaking of his purpose and feelings, the author says, "he has endeavored to write in such a spirit and to produce such a volume, that all liberal-minded and liberal-hearted persons might read it without pain or disturbance, either to their religious convictions, whether high-church, low-church, or no-church; or to their political feelings, whether Democrats, Republicans, or whatever else they might be; and, furthermore, a volume that could safely be recommended to pious young men, especially to students for the ministry, who really desired to be useful, and to be abreast of their age, on this subject." (Price \$3.50.)

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL CONFERENCES OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH, FOR THE YEAR 1875. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1876.

Dr. Summers has placed this octavo pamphlet in our hands, and we find interest in it, from the statistical stand-point especially. There are eight bishops of this branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church, viz.: R. Paine, D.D., Aberdeen, Miss.; G. F. Pierce, D.D., Sparta, Ga.; H. H. Kavanaugh, D.D., Louisville, Ky.; W. M. Wightman, D.D., Charleston, S. C.; E. M. Marvin, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.; D. S. Doggett, D.D., Richmond, Va.; H. N. McTyeire, D.D., Nashville, Tenn.; J. C. Keener, D.D., New Orleans, La. There are thirty-seven Conferences, as follows: Baltimore, Virginia, Western Virginia, Holston, North Carolina, South Carolina, North Georgia, South Georgia, Florida, Alabama, North Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Mississippi, Memphis, Tennessee, Kentucky, Louisville, St. Louis, Southwest Missouri, Missouri, Western, Denver, Indian Mission, Arkansas, White River, Little Rock, North Texas, East Texas, Texas, Northwest Texas, West Texas, German Mission, Los Angeles,

Pacific, Columbia, Illinois. Besides these are the China Mission, Mexican Mission, and Brazilian Mission, whose members are yet connected with home Conferences. The statistics of all these Conferences and Missions foot up as follows: Traveling preachers, 3,271; superannuated preachers, 259; local preachers, 5,462; white members, 715,951; colored members, 2,083; Indian members, 4,335; total preachers and members, 731,361; increase, 23,929; decrease, 5,333; infants baptized, 22,603; adults baptized, 38,908; Sunday-schools, 7,578; teachers, 49,797; Sunday-school scholars, 346,759; collection for Conference claimants, \$64,326.18; collection for missions, \$120,128.31. In connection with these facts, it is stated that "the colored members, for the most part, have left our connection for the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America, organized by our bishops under the authority of the General Conference—they are reported in their own minutes—hence the apparent decrease in that department." The "decrease" was to the number of five hundred and eighty members from the previous year. The table shows an increase of forty-seven traveling preachers, one hundred and six local preachers, three hundred and seventy-four Sunday-schools, nine hundred and seventy-two Sunday-school teachers, and eighteen thousand one hundred and twenty-five Sunday-school scholars, over the previous year. The Indian members show a small decrease. It is remarkable that there should have been over two thousand less infants and over ten thousand less adults baptized in 1875 than in 1874.

The three Conferences in the State of Tennessee show together the largest number of active ministers in any one State; that is, four hundred and sixty-nine; Texas being next largest, with three hundred and thirty-five; Georgia next, with two hundred and seventy-nine; Missouri next, with two hundred and forty-six; Alabama next, with two hundred and thirty-nine; then follow Mississippi and others, with lessening numbers. Tennessee sums up one hundred and ten thousand four hundred and eighty members; Georgia comes next in this count, with eighty-two thousand eight hundred and twenty-four; Virginia next, we believe, and so on.